# REPORT ON
# PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS
# ON FOREST DEVELOPMENT IN
# NORTHERN ALBERTA

Submitted to:

**THE MINISTER OF FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE**

**Concord Scientific Corporation**

October, 1989

90-03860/

# Concord Scientific Corporation

[illegible] FIFTH AVENUE SOUTHWEST CALGARY ALBERTA T2P 3H5
TELEPHONE 403 264-2140 FAX 403 237-7634 TELEX 038-24554

October 16, 1989

The Hon. E.L. Fjordbotten
Minister, Forestry Lands and Wildlife
403 Legislature Building
Edmonton Alberta
T5K 2B6

Dear Mr. Minister:

We are pleased to submit our REPORT ON PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS ON FOREST DEVELOPMENT IN NORTHERN ALBERTA.

The series of forty-one open houses and public meetings were attended by more than 1900 people who were able to obtain information from members of your staff, ask questions or express concerns related to the forest industry expansion in northern Alberta. The open and informal process provided the opportunity for people to speak freely on a wide range of topics. The information gathered has been grouped under five major headings: Forest Management, Fish and Wildlife, Environmental, Social and Economic and Communications and Consultation. The media scanning and the analysis of questionnaires provides additional insight into the public response to the expansion of the forest industry.

We feel that the process of informal public meetings has been useful, and that the information contained in this report will be valuable in the future work of your Department.

Respectfully submitted,

CONCORD SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION

Don L. Dabbs
Vice President

PEARCE CONSULTING SERVICES LTD.

H. Gordon Pearce
President

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| | Table of Contents | ii |
| | List of Tables | iii |
| | List of Appendices | iv |
| | Executive Summary | vi |
| 1.0 | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2.0 | STUDY METHODOLOGY | 3 |
| 3.0 | MONITORING OPEN HOUSES AND PUBLIC MEETINGS | 7 |
| | Attendance at Meetings | 7 |
| | Assessment of Public Comments | 9 |
| 4.0 | REVIEW OF BRIEFS SUBMITTED TO PUBLIC MEETINGS | 17 |
| | Fort McKay Band Position Paper | 17 |
| | Aboriginal Resource Development Group Position Paper | 18 |
| | Sherwood Park Fish and Game Association | 21 |
| | Friends of the Athabasca | 22 |
| 5.0 | MEDIA SCANNING | 25 |
| | Introduction | 25 |
| | Assessment of Media Issues | 25 |
| | Results and Analysis | 26 |
| 6.0 | QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS | 31 |
| | Introduction | 31 |
| | Assessment of Questionnaires | 31 |
| | Results and Analysis | 33 |
| 7.0 | CONCLUSIONS | 37 |

## LIST OF TABLES


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Schedule of Open Houses and Public Meetings | 2 |
| 2. | Attendance at Open House and Public Meetings | 7 |
| 3. | Four Major Issue Areas | 10 |
| 4. | Ranking of Forest Management Subjects | 11 |
| 5. | Ranking of Fish and Wildlife Subjects | 12 |
| 6. | Ranking of Environmental Subjects | 13 |
| 7. | Ranking of Social and Economic Subjects | 15 |
| 8. | Ranking of Communication and Consultation Subjects | 16 |
| 9. | Newspapers Scanned by Forest District | 26 |
| 10. | Breakdown of Letters, Editorials and Articles by Forest District | 26 |
| 11. | Media Scanning Key Words | 27 |
| 12. | Overall Ranking of Key Words | 27 |
| 13. | Ranking of Key Words by Forest District | 28 |
| 14. | Rank of Concerns for all Questionnaires based on Responses to Question One | 33 |
| 15. | Rank of Concerns by Forest District Based on Responses to Question One | 34 |
| 16. | Question 2: Did This Meeting Provide You With the Information You Were Seeking? | 35 |
| 17. | Question 3: Did You Find the Speakers to be Informed and Open to Your Comments? | 35 |
| 18. | Question 4: Did You Feel The Open House Session was Worthwhile? | 36 |
| 19. | Question 5: Do You Feel the Information Exchange Was Worthwhile? | 36 |
| 20. | Question 6: Would You Like Further Information Sent to You Regarding Alberta's Forest Resource? | 36 |

## LIST OF APPENDICES


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| A. | Summary Record of Open Houses and Public Meetings | 39 |
| | Peace River Forest | A-1 |
| | Keg River | A-1 |
| | Dixonville | A-1 |
| | Manning | A-2 |
| | Three Creeks | A-3 |
| | Weberville | A-3 |
| | Hines Creek | A-5 |
| | Worsely | A-6 |
| | Grande Prairie Forest | A-7 |
| | Eaglesham | A-7 |
| | Spirit River | A-7 |
| | Bonanza | A-8 |
| | Beaverlodge | A-9 |
| | Grovedale | A-10 |
| | Debolt | A-10 |
| | Valleyview | A-11 |
| | Grande Prairie | A-12 |
| | Whitecourt Forest | A-14 |
| | Swan Hills | A-14 |
| | Fort Assiniboine | A-14 |
| | Slave Lake Forest | A-15 |
| | Slave Lake | A-15 |
| | Kinuso | A-16 |
| | High Prairie | A-16 |
| | Red Earth | A-16 |
| | Peerless Lake | A-17 |
| | Whitefish/Gift Lake | A-17 |
| | Smith | A-17 |
| | Fawcett | A-18 |
| | Wabasca | A-18 |
| | Chipewyan Lakes | A-19 |
| | Lac La Biche Forest | A-19 |
| | Grassland | A-19 |
| | Lac La Biche | A-20 |
| | Conklin/Janvier | A-23 |
| | Boyle | A-23 |
| | Athabasca | A-24 |
| | Calling Lake | A-26 |
| | Wandering River | A-28 |
| | Glendon | A-28 |
| | Grand Centre | A-28 |

LIST OF APPENDICES
(continued)


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| | Athabasca Forest | A-30 |
| | Fort Chipewyan | A-30 |
| | Fort Smith, N.W.T. | A-31 |
| | Anzac | A-31 |
| | Fort McKay | A-33 |
| | Fort McMurray | A-35 |
| B. | Analysis of Comments from The Open House And Public Meetings | B-1 |
| C. | Media Scanning Key Word Matrix | C-1 |
| D. | Alberta Forestry, Lands and Wildlife Questionnaire | D-1 |
| E. | Analysis of Questionnaire Responses | E-1 |

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife initiated a series of open houses and public meetings in forty communities across northern Alberta, and an information meeting in Fort Smith, N.W.T. during February to May 1989. In total, more than 1900 people attended the meetings which were part of a process designed to convey information on:

- The role of the Department in the management of the forests, public lands, and fish and wildlife; and
- Recently announced forestry developments.

The meetings also provided the public with an opportunity to express concerns and ask questions on forest management and development both in the meetings and by way of a questionnaire.

This study presents the subjects raised and some of the responses given by department and proponent representatives at the open houses and public meetings. In addition, key issues raised by the public through written responses to the questionnaire and from an analysis of local, regional and national newspapers are identified.

This report is submitted to the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. The report will be used by the Expert Panel on Forest Management, appointed by the Minister, who are charged with the responsibility of considering the technical merits of the issues and concerns originating from the forest industry expansion in northern Alberta and identified at the public meetings and open houses.

## OPEN HOUSES AND PUBLIC MEETINGS

In total, forty-nine subjects were raised at the public meetings. These are grouped and discussed under five major headings: Forest Management, Fish and Wildlife, Environmental, Social and Economic and Communications and Consultation.

Four major issue areas emerge from the comments and concerns of participants at the meetings. These are:

- Forest Practices;
- Forest Management Agreement Process;
- Public Participation in Decision Making; and
- Emissions from Plants.

Participants expressed significant interest in forest practices. Key subjects included reforestation, timber harvesting techniques, and sustained yield. More specifically, participants wanted assurance that programs are in place to provide forests for future generations. Control of access to prevent over harvesting of fish and wildlife was identified as a major requirement in the management plans of the expansion in forest industry activities.

A large number of participants expressed dissatisfaction with the planning and negotiations for Forest Management Agreements (FMA's). Specific concerns included the number and size of FMA's, the concentration of timber supply, and that FMA's were completed without the benefit of public input. There was also doubt about the economic benefit of the agreements. People expressed concern that there is too much government investment in an industry that may be at the peak of an economic cycle. There were many questions regarding stumpage fees, and a feeling that the government may not get a sufficiently high return from the sale of the resources.

Public participation in the decision-making process was raised in relation to the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process, as well as the FMA's. Participants stated explicit concerns with

the style of decision-making, and many felt that the government was not representing their interests. The absence of Alberta Environment at the meetings to respond to questions on environmental protection contributed to a feeling that all information was not forthcoming. The fact that EIA and FMA are separate processes has resulted in confusion, and repeated requests for an integrated review of both the plants and the forest operations.

Air and water emissions from plants were of particular concern in communities near, and downstream of, proposed pulp mills on both the Athabasca and Peace rivers.

## MEDIA SCANNING

Issues related to northern forest developments raised in the print media were assembled by monitoring newspapers between June, 1988 and May, 1989. A total of 10 provincial and national, and 27 local and regional (northern Alberta) newspapers were scanned, producing a total of 807 clippings which were entered into a data base.

The monitoring provided an excellent gauge of media coverage on issues related to northern forestry development. It was a relatively accurate indicator of the public mood, and was supported by findings from the open houses and public meetings, plus the questionnaires completed by the participants at these meetings.

The major issues revealed through the media scanning are:

- Implications of mill developments on environment and the economy;
- The closed-door style and approach of government decision-making;
- The lack of a comprehensive environmental impact assessment process; and
- Inadequate public involvement.

These issues appear consistently in both the local and provincial/national print media, with no urban/rural split on most of the issues. While the economic benefits of forestry development were identified, there were major concerns about environmental protection.

## QUESTIONNAIRES

Questionnaires were available at all open houses and public meetings. Participants were encouraged to fill them out to identify concerns regarding forest resource use, plus provide their impressions on various aspects of the public information sessions.

A total of 352 participants completed the questionnaire and the overwhelming public concern identified was the need for adequate reforestation. Second and third ranked concerns were about the impact of development on wildlife, and pollution of water and air.

# CHAPTER 1

# INTRODUCTION

The Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife initiated a series of open houses and public meetings in forty communities across northern Alberta, and an information meeting in Fort Smith, N.W.T. This series of meetings, held during February to May 1989, was part of a process designed to convey information on:

- the role of the Department in the management of the forests, public lands, and fish and wildlife; and
- recently announced forestry developments.

The meetings provided the public an opportunity to express concerns and ask questions on forest management both in the meetings and by way of a questionnaire.

The open houses and public meetings were organized by the staff of the Alberta Forest Service (AFS), under the direction of the Superintendent in each of the Peace River, Grande Prairie, Whitecourt, Slave Lake, Lac La Biche and Athabasca forest districts. Table 1 identifies the community, dates, location and type of meeting.

An important aspect of the process was the establishment of an Expert Panel on Forest Management to review the issues and concerns originating from the forest industry expansion in northern Alberta and identified at the public meetings and open houses, and to make recommendations in response to the concerns.

An open house was organized for each of the forty-one communities listed in Table 1, which usually started in the afternoon and extended into the evening. The normal arrangement in the hall or school gymnasium included a large display by the Alberta Forest Service (AFS), with smaller displays by the Public Lands Division (PL) and Fish and Wildlife Division (F&W). In most communities the forest companies that have projects, or propose expanded or new projects, were also in attendance with displays and information. Generally, there was only one company at each open house, although there were meetings with up to three companies represented.

As individuals or groups arrived at an open house they were led through the displays by an AFS staff member who explained the information on the display panels and answered questions regarding the material or other issues. The order of presentation usually started with the Forest Service display, went on to Public Lands and Fish & Wildlife displays and ended with the company display. This order was amended, when dictated by the size of the hall and the availability of some of the display material.

There were fourteen public meetings in addition to the open houses. The meetings were chaired by a moderator and included a panel made up of Alberta Forest Service, Public Lands and Fish & Wildlife staff, company representatives and sometimes a community representative, such as the Mayor or an environmental group spokesperson. Members of the panel made short presentations. The meetings were then opened up to questions from the floor.

Concord was appointed by the Minister to attend the open houses and public meetings, to record the issues raised and responses given by departmental and company representatives.

In addition to their oral comments, the public was encouraged to provide written comments by completing a questionnaire that was available at all meetings. Responses have been analysed and the results are presented in this report.

The local, regional and provincial newspapers were recognized as an important source of information reflective of public opinion, and the Concord study was expanded to include an analysis of newspaper articles covering the time period June, 1988 to May, 1989.

This report summarizes the issues, questions and comments of support from a wide cross-section of the public in the regions of the Province that will be affected by the forest developments. The report is submitted to The Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife and the Expert Panel on Forest Management for their use in responding to the concerns of northern Albertans. To facilitate this process, the results are summarized and discussed under five major subject headings:

- Forest Management
- Fish and Wildlife
- Environmental
- Social and Economic
- Communications and Consultation

The project team was headed by Don Dabbs and Gordon Pearce. Susie Washington assisted with the design of the program and has been responsible for the analysis and evaluation of questionnaires and press clippings. Ms Washington has been assisted by Cheryl Bradley and Dawn Mitchell. Don James and Craig Heath attended most of the open houses and public meetings to observe and record the proceedings. Due to timing conflicts, or the distance between consecutive meetings, some open houses were attended by Nick Roe and Judy Smith.

Table 1. Schedule of Open Houses and Public Meetings.

| FOREST | COMMUNITY | DATES (1989) | LOCATION | OPEN HOUSE | PUBLIC MEETING |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Peace River | Keg River | February 15th | Keg River Hall | • | |
| | Dixonville | February 16th | Dixonville Hall | • | • |
| | Manning | February 17th | Elks Hall | • | |
| | Three Creeks | February 20th | McKinney Hall | • | |
| | Weberville | February 21st | Weberville Hall | • | • |
| | Hines Creek | February 22nd | Rec Complex | • | |
| | Worsley | February 23rd | Fellowship Centre | • | |
| Grande Prairie | Eaglesham | February 28th | Eaglesham Hall | • | |
| | Spirit River | March 1st | Legion Hall | • | |
| | Bonanza | March 2nd | Community Hall | • | |
| | Beaverlodge | April 6th | Community Hall | • | |
| | Grovedale | April 7th | Community Hall | • | |
| | Debolt | April 11th | Centennial Hall | • | |
| | Valleyview | April 12th | Memorial Hall | • | |
| | Grande Praire | April 21st | Muskoseepi Park | • | • |
| Whitecourt | Swan Hills | February 22nd | AFS Staging Camp | • | |
| | Fort Assiniboine | April 12th | Legion Hall | • | |
| Slave Lake Forest | Slave Lake | February 20th | Sawridge Hotel | • | • |
| | Kinuso | February 21st | Seniors Lodge | • | |
| | High Prairie | February 23rd | Elks Hall | • | |
| | Red Earth | February 27th | Community Hall | • | |
| | Peerless Lake | February 28th | Community Hall | • | |
| | Whitefish/ Gift Lake | March 1st | Community Hall (Atikameg) | • | |
| | Smith | April 6th | Community Hall | • | |
| | Fawcett | April 7th | Community Hall | • | |
| | Wabasca | April 21st | Rec. Complex | • | |
| | Chipewyan Lake | May 4th | School Gym | • | |
| Lac La Biche | Grassland | February 28th | Community Hall | • | • |
| | Lac La Biche | March 9th | Jubilee Hall | • | • |
| | Conklin/Janvier | April 10th | Conklin School | • | |
| | Boyle | April 24th | Community Hall | • | • |
| | Athabasca | April 25th | Legion Basement | • | • |
| | Calling Lake | April 26th | Community Centre | • | • |
| | Wandering River | April 27th | Breynat Hall | • | |
| | Glendon | May 1st | Arena Complex | • | |
| | Grand Centre | May 2nd | Lakeland Inn | • | • |
| Athabasca | Fort Chipewyan | February 23rd | Community Hall | | |
| | | | Lodge | • | • |
| | Fort Smith, N.W.T. | February 24th | Wood Buffalo Park Theatre | • | |
| | Anzac | April 11th | Community Hall | • | • |
| | Fort McKay | April 12th | Multi-plex | • | • |
| | Fort McMurray | April 13th | Oil Sands Interpretive Centre | • | • |

# CHAPTER 2

# STUDY METHODOLOGY

Three sources of information have been utilized in this study. The first, and most important, has been the monitoring of open houses and public meetings where local residents had an opportunity to ask questions and voice opinions. The second source of information has been questionnaires handed out at the meetings which were completed in the hall or mailed into the regional or Edmonton office of the Alberta Forest Service. The third source of information has been gathered from local, regional and provincial newspapers; including letters to the editor, editorials and articles.

## MONITORING OPEN HOUSES AND PUBLIC MEETINGS

One observer from the study team was present at each meeting, and occasionally additional members of the study team were present at the open house if a public meeting was scheduled to follow. To ensure consistency of reporting, only one member of the study team recorded the comments and questions raised. Due to the number of concurrent conversations, however, it was not always possible to listen in on all questions and answers. Therefore, some information was probably lost, particularly answers from AFS staff as the focus of attention was on the comments from members of the public. To ensure that most issues were recorded, the study team observer participated in the debriefing following each meeting. During the debriefing, all key concerns, questions and comments were compiled based on the collective experience of the Department staff and company representatives.

Most of the public meetings were recorded on tape, and a record of the proceedings was compiled using the tape and other notes. A formal transcript, however, was not prepared. A study team observer was present at all public meetings and took notes on the dialogue between the panel and public. A debriefing session usually followed the public meeting to review and record major issues or commitments made in response to questions raised.

The notes and records from the forty-one open houses and fourteen public meetings have been summarized and are presented in Appendix A. If an issue was raised at a meeting, it was recorded. The number of times the issue was raised during the meeting, however, was not recorded.

The concerns raised by the public have been grouped under five major subject headings, as identified in the Introduction. Within the major subject headings, comments have been assigned to subheadings and organized on a matrix according to forest district (Appendix B). The matrixes have been used to calculate the frequency with which subjects were raised, and to rank the subjects from highest to lowest for all forest districts. These results are discussed in Chapter 3.

Comments made at the open houses and public meetings were assigned to one or more of the following forty-nine sub-headings.

1) Forest Management subjects:

- Sustained Yield
- Reforestation
- Negotiations for FMA's
- FMA Planning Process
- Integrated Resource Planning
- Disposition of Timber
- Harvest Techniques
- Enforcement/Regulation of Industry
- Access and Public Use
- Environmental Impact Assessment
- Staffing Requirements

2) Fish and Wildlife Subjects:

- General Impacts
- Wildlife Impacts
- Fisheries Impacts
- Rare and Endangered Species
- Inventory and Management
- Habitat Protection
- Native Hunting
- Access and Over-Hunting

3) Environmental subjects:

- General Environmental Concerns
- Pollution (air & water)
- Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Herbicides
- Soil Erosion
- Protection of Ecosystems
- Climate Change
- Risk Assessment
- Technology Options
- Recycling Products
- Historical Sites

4) Social and Economic subjects:

- Quality of Life
- Employment
- Outfitting
- Trapping
- Tourism
- Recreation
- Agriculture
- Traffic
- Aesthetics
- Native Land Claims
- Foreign Ownership
- Markets and Economic Return
- Woodlots

5) Communication and Consultation subjects:

- Public Participation
- Public Hearings on Forestry Projects
- Honesty of Gov't and Industry
- Positive Comments on Development
- Absence of Alberta Environment

**Review of Written Briefs**

Several participants came to the public meetings with written briefs. To ensure accurate reporting, their written material was collected and is summarized in Chapter 4.

## MEDIA SCANNING

Ten provincial/national and twenty-seven local/regional newspapers were tracked by a clipping service for articles on northern forestry developments during the period January 1 to May 30, 1989. Clippings from a previous June to December, 1988 data base, primarily dealing with the Athabasca pulp mill development, were also included. A total of 807 clippings, 126 from unidentified sources and 681 from identifiable sources, were included in the data base.

Sources were divided into the six forest districts, as well as a provincial/national category.

Each clipping was identified by type: article, editorial or letter. Seventeen key words were then used to analyze content. One clipping could be assigned several key words, depending on the extent of information and issues covered. Key words were selected to correspond with major subject areas identified from a representative sample of clippings.

All clippings were coded and entered into a computerized data base (DBASE IV) Each clipping was identified by title, source, date, type and key words.

The DBASE IV software package was used to calculate the frequency with which a certain key word occurred for all clippings, for each forest region, and for provincial and national sources (Appendix C).

'Unidentified sources' were those clippings with no identified newspaper. As these clippings were part of the sample,

they were included in calculations of total frequencies of key words.

Key word frequencies were ranked from highest to lowest for all clippings, for each forest district, and for provincial and national sources. This ranking was used as a measure of relative importance of subjects.

Different sampling techniques used by different clipping services, have resulted in inconsistencies in the data base for some sources and some time periods. Therefore, the data cannot be subjected to statistical analysis.

## QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

Responses to a questionnaire designed and distributed by Forestry, Lands and Wildlife at the open houses and public meetings were reviewed and analyzed. In total, 352 questionnaires were filled out and returned by those attending the sessions. A sample of the questionnaire is included in Appendix D.

The first question asked respondents to identify their concerns regarding forest resource use in the area. The remaining five questions asked people's impressions of various aspects of the public information sessions.

The 352 questionnaires were grouped according to forest district - Athabasca, Grande Prairie, Lac La Biche, Peace River, Slave Lake and Whitecourt.

Responses to each of the six questions were coded and entered into a computerized data base (DBASE IV). Each questionnaire was identified by forest region, and a number assigned it based on the order in which it was entered into the data base. Concerns identified under Question 1 were coded according to thirty-seven categories, as closely matched to the subjects used to classify the issues from the public meetings as the level of information would allow, as well as under "no concerns" or "no response". Responses to Questions 2 through 6 were coded as "yes", "no", "undecided" and "no response". Comments were abbreviated, and also entered into the data base.

The DBASE IV software package was used to calculate the frequency with which a certain response occurred. These frequencies were calculated for each forest region, and for all regions together.

Frequencies for concerns identified in Question 1 are presented in Appendix E. They were ranked from highest to lowest for each forest region, and for all questionnaires. This ranking was used as a measure of the relative importance of a concern within, and among, forest districts for those who attended the sessions and filled out the questionnaires.

As the questionnaire was completed on an "ad hoc" basis, and there was no consistency in the sampling techniques, this is not a statistically valid survey of attitudes in the general population, either regionally or provincially. Rather, it is a gauge of key concerns of people who attended the public information sessions and filled out the questionnaire. The statistical validity is further limited, as questionnaires were neither a random sampling of people who attended the sessions, nor were they filled out by everyone who attended. Additionally, because names and addresses were requested on the questionnaire, people may have been reluctant to express strong feelings, either positive or negative.

# CHAPTER 3

# MONITORING OPEN HOUSES AND PUBLIC MEETINGS

The forty-one open houses and fourteen public meetings started in Keg River February 15, 1989, and ended in Glendon May 3, 1989. They were spread across the six forest districts affected by the proposed developments.

The informal open-house format was a useful and effective way of conveying information and responding to questions one-on-one. Many individuals had an opportunity to discuss their concerns directly with a member of the Forest Service, Public Land or Fish and Wildlife staff. The fourteen public meetings were organized to provide a more structured exchange of questions and answers between the public, departmental staff and company representatives.

This chapter contains a discussion of the questions, issues and comments raised at the open houses and public meetings.

## ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS

Open houses were held at each of the communities identified in Table 2. The open houses were held in the afternoon on the dates indicated, and in fourteen communities the open house was followed by a public meeting. Table 2 shows the total attendance at the open house, or both, if a public meeting was also called in the community.

The size of the community, and its proximity to a proposed new forest development, generally affected the attendance at meetings. Table 2 contains general information on the meetings and comments that help to explain large or small attendance at meetings. In all, more than 1900 people attended the series of meetings.

Table 2. Attendance at Open House and Public Meetings.

| Forest District | Meeting Location | Date | Public Meeting | Total Attendence | Special Groups Present | Observers Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PEACE RIVER | Keg River | Feb. 15 | | 12 | | Small resident population. |
| | Dixonville | Feb. 16 | X | 48 | | 26 school children at open house. |
| | Manning | Feb. 17 | | 68 | Friends of the Peace (late) | Good turnout for a Friday. |
| | Three Creeks | Feb. 20 | | 19 | | Local Insitu plant laid off 22% of their employees today, may have affected the attendance. |
| | Weberville | Feb. 21 | X | 75 | Friends of the Peace<br>Peace River F & G Assoc.<br>Local Trappers Assoc.<br>Local Outfitters | |
| | Hines Creek | Feb. 22 | | 69 | Fish & Game Assoc.<br>Outfitters Assoc.<br>Friends of the Peace | Good turnout for size of community. |
| | Worsley | Feb. 23 | | 35 | Friends of the Peace<br>Outfitters Assoc. | Not directly affected by development. |
| GRANDE PRAIRIE | Eaglesham | Feb. 28 | | 12 | | |
| | Spirit River | Mar. 1 | | 25 | | Not directly affected by development. |
| | Bonanza | Mar. 2 | | 42 | | 22 were a class of students. |
| | Beaverlodge | Apr. 6 | | 149 | | Local service group held BBQ - encouraged attendance. |
| | Grovedale | Apr. 7 | | 19 | | Acreage community, not directly affected by development - Friday meeting. |
| | Debolt | Apr. 11 | | 31 | S.Peace Env. Assoc. | |
| | Valleyview | Apr. 12 | | 33 | Local F & G Assoc.<br>Instructor from Vocational Col. | Not directly affected by project. |
| | Grande Prairie | Apr. 21 | X | 165 | Friends of the Peace<br>Regional Development Board<br>Grazing Assoc. | Open house - facility not easily found.<br>Open house and meeting on same day - low attendance at the open house. |

Table 2 cont'd.

| Forest District | Meeting Location | Date | Public Meeting | Attendance | Special Groups Present | Observers Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WHITECOURT | Swan Hills | Feb. 26 | | 12 | Local F & G Assoc. | Not directly affected by project. |
| | Ft. Assiniboine | Apr. 12 | | 19 | | Community not directly affected. |
| SLAVE LAKE | Slave Lake | Feb. 20 | X | 45 | Big Stone Indian Band<br>Town Council | Expected more of a turnout. |
| | Kinuso | Feb. 21 | | 9 | | Small community located between development - local hockey game. |
| | High Prairie | Feb. 23 | | 25 | Friends of the Slave | No development in area. |
| | Red Earth | Feb. 27 | | 10 | | |
| | Peerless Lake | Feb. 28 | | 20 | Bigstone Band | |
| | Whitefish/Gift Lake | Mar. 4 | | 8 | | |
| | Smith | Apr. 6 | | 7 | Friends of The Athabasca | Power Outage 4 pm - 5:50 pm may have reduced attendance - Stanley Cup Hockey Game. |
| | Fawcett | Apr. 7 | | 14 | | |
| | Wabasca | Apr. 28 | | 12 | | Stanley Cup Hockey Game. |
| | Chipewyan Lakes | May. 4 | | 12 | | |
| LAC LA BICHE | Grassland | Feb. 25 | X | 140 | Friends of the Athabasca<br>Lac La Biche Fish & Game<br>Regional Devel. Officers<br>Athabasca Trappers Assoc. | Conflict with election meetings. |
| | Lac La Biche | Mar. 9 | X | 73 | Friends of the Athabasca<br>F & G Assoc. (Lac La Biche) | Competition for attendance with Federal by-elections, Provincial election. |
| | Conklin/Janvier | Apr. 10 | | 45 | Athabasca Native Dev. Corp.<br>Metis Assoc. | Total includes 27 children. |
| | Boyle | Apr. 24 | X | 45 | Friends of the Athabasca<br>Town Council | Community pre-development, removed from impacts. |
| | Athabasca | Apr. 25 | X | 125 | Friends of the Athabasca<br>Alberta Fish and Game<br>Lac La Biche F & G<br>Athabasca F & G<br>Trappers Assoc.<br>Town Council & Mayor | |
| | Calling Lake | Apr. 26 | X | 30 | Friends of the Athabasca<br>Local Town Council<br>Band Admin. Officer | Small community - pre-development. |
| | Wandering River | Apr. 27 | | 31 | Chamber of Commerce | Meeting held 20 km from Wandering River - small community. |
| | Grand Centre | May. 2 | X | 58 | Comm. Adv. Comm.<br>Alberta Trappers Assoc.<br>Native Outreach<br>Friends of The Athabasca<br>Local LTP Holders<br>Nor-Sask Forest Prod. | |
| | Glendon | May. 3 | | 21 | Glendon Agri. Soc.<br>Village of Glendon | Poor time of year for farming community. |
| ATHABASCA | Ft. Chipewyan | Feb. 23 | X | 69 | Alberta Trappers Assoc.<br>Cree Chip Dev. Corp.<br>Cree Indian Band<br>Delta Fisherman's Assoc.<br>Ft. Chipewyan Metis Ass.<br>Canadians for Responsible Northern Development<br>Peace Athabasca Trappers Association<br>Wood Buffalo Nat. Park | Open house total includes 28 public school students.<br>Bingo night affected attendance.<br>Alberta ID meeting reduced attendance. |
| | Ft. Smith, NWT | Feb. 24 | | 21 | Ft. Smith Town Council<br>Chamber of Commerce<br>Wood Buffalo National Park<br>Environment Canada<br>Town Council | |
| | Anzac | Apr. 11 | X | 24 | Athabasca Nat. Dev. Assoc.<br>Metis Assoc. (Zone 1)<br>Anzac Metis Assoc.<br>Local Trappers Assoc. | Stanley Cup Hockey Game. |
| | Ft. McKay | Apr. 12 | X | 30 | Fort McKay Indian Band<br>Athabasca Nat. Dev. Corp. | Lack of attendance from the general public unexplained in relation to amount of notification given. |
| | Ft. McMurry | Apr. 13 | X | 216 | Ft. McMurray Env. Assoc.<br>Athabasca Nat. Dev. Assoc.<br>Canadians for Responsible Northern Development<br>Alberta Trappers Assoc.<br>Ft. McMurray Metis Local<br>Zone 1 Metis Assoc.<br>Members of Forestry Panel | Stanley Cup Hockey Game.<br>Several classes of school children were bused in. |

## ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

People across northern Alberta took the opportunity to participate in this informal process to obtain information and to express concerns regarding forest management and development. To assess issues and concerns, comments raised at all meetings have been summarized. This section examines the nature of the subjects raised, and identifies the key issues.

The questions, comments and concerns summarized in Appendix A were classified into the 5 major subject headings and 49 sub-headings presented in Chapter 2. The results are presented on matrix tables in Appendix B, and discussed in this section.

### Forest Management

The series of open houses and public meetings were organized in response to the announcements regarding forest developments, and forest management subjects turned out to be the top-ranked concerns of the public at all meetings. Table 3 ranks the eleven forest management subjects.

The top-ranked concern was reforestation which included the regulations governing reforestation, adequacy of reforestation and selection of species. It was raised at 29 of the 41 meetings. This concern was summarized by an individual in Dixonville when it was stated that "we must assure timber availability for generations to come". The public interest in reforestation is viewed as a request for reassurance that if large-scale forest development proceeds the government has a program in place to ensure replacement of the forests.

There also is a widespread public concern related to Forest Management Agreements (FMA), reflected in the second and third ranked subject areas. People want to know what an FMA is, how it works, how the government and a company negotiate a FMA, and what opportunities are available to the public for input into an FMA.

More specifically, the planning process for the Forest Management Agreements ranked as the second most frequent subject raised. This included questions such as the reliability of the timber cruise data, and what happens to the FMA's if the data are not accurate. People were concerned about the details of the FMA, such as the twenty year duration, and does this mean that all the timber is liquidated at the end of twenty years.

In their questions about the planning process for the FMA's, people expressed concern about the width of buffer zones around lakes. At more than one meeting individuals expressed their concern about logging too close to the Peace River valley. The size and shape of cutblocks were also questioned.

Though clearly related to the second-ranked concern, the negotiation process for FMA's included questions which were more specific to negotiations rather than the broader issue of the planning process. These included concerns such as the number and scale of development commitments made in a short time, and that they were conducted "behind closed doors". Concerns also included the size of FMA's, and the level of annual forest depletion.

Staffing requirements came up at meetings in all but one forest district. The public is concerned about the ability of the Forest Service and the Fish and Wildlife Division to handle the new developments. Forest Service staff increases were seen as necessary to ensure compliance with the ground rules and reforestation monitoring. Fish and Wildlife staff increases were seen as necessary to inventory wildlife populations, to manage and enforce wildlife regulations and to deal with the concern regarding increased access.

Table 3. Ranking of forest management subjects.

| Rank | Concern | Number of times an item was raised |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Reforestation | 29 |
| 2 | FMA planning process | 28 |
| 3 | Negotiations for FMA's | 20 |
| 3 | Government staffing levels too low | 20 |
| 4 | Timber harvest techniques | 15 |
| 5 | Disposition of timber | 14 |
| 6 | Questions regarding sustained yield | 11 |
| 7 | EIA for forest operations | 8 |
| 8 | Integrated resource planning | 7 |
| 9 | Enforcement and regulation of industry | 3 |
| 9 | Access control and public use | 3 |

The fourth-ranked subject related to concerns regarding timber harvest techniques. These included issues such as preserving softwood understory when harvesting the hardwood overstory, what are the benefits and concerns of clear-cutting, strong dislike for clear-cutting, and "...will there be a second operation after aspen harvest to log the conifers?".

Most of the concerns related to the disposition of timber focussed on the opportunities for small operators and the availability of wood to them in the future. Part of this issue related to the security of timber supply to permit holders. This fifth-ranked category also included the concern that the recently announced projects will concentrate wood supply among a few large companies.

Sustained yield ranked sixth, and was usually presented as a question by people who were interested in information on methods used to calculate the volumes of available timber and the adequacy of future timber supplies. They also asked "Can we sustain current harvest with new development?". This concern is closely linked to the top ranked concern, reforestation.

The request for an Environmental Impact Assessment for the forest operation, not just the pulp mills, ranked as the seventh most frequently raised issue. Several people called for "...a scientific and independent impact assessment of the woodlands operation".

Questions regarding the Integrated Resource Plans came up mostly at meetings in the Lac La Biche forest district, but ranked eighth overall. These related to potential conflicts between resource plans and a FMA, or questions about the timing for completion of certain planning programs.

Enforcement and regulation of industry, and access control and public use were the ninth-ranked subjects, as both were only raised three times. The latter point relates to concerns regarding the ability to gain access to forest management areas for the purpose of hunting and fishing.

### Fish and Wildlife

Public concern for fish and wildlife subjects were raised most frequently in meetings held in the Grande Prairie and Lac La Biche forest districts. However, concern was raised in all forest districts,

and in some cases they have been classified as social and economic concerns as they related to trapping.

Table 4 presents the ranking of subjects related to fish and wildlife. The number one concern relates to the improved access resulting from the construction of logging roads which could lead to over-hunting. An access control program, including staff to implement it, was requested to alleviate the concern over this issue.

The number two-ranked subject was habitat protection. Issues related to this subject included the definition and protection of critical wintering areas, the retention of old growth forest for species that rely on this type of habitat, and three-vs two-pass logging to protect ungulate habitat.

Wildlife impacts, which referred to general concern about the forest development on wildlife, were the third-ranked subject. Other topics under this subject included the concern for moose and caribou populations and the length of the hunting season.

The fourth-ranked subject was wildlife inventory and management. Most of the comments on this subject were raised at meetings in the Lac La Biche forest district. They related to the size of budget of the Fish and Wildlife Division and the need for much more inventory and monitoring of populations, and the clarification of the Government's 1984 policy on fish and wildlife.

The issue of increased native hunting was a specific concern associated with increased access and over-hunting. This fifth-ranked subject is associated with the number one concern of over-hunting.

Fisheries impacts were raised only five times. Generally, fisheries concerns were addressed under the subject of water quality, which is the top-ranked issue under environmental subjects. Therefore, the concern about fisheries impacts was much higher than is indicated on Table 4.

The concern for rare and endangered species, most noteably caribou, was also ranked in sixth place. The need for more inventory data was emphasized, since without proper data, management and protection plans cannot be designed and effectively implemented.

The seventh-ranked subject related to general impact concerns. In the informal setting of the open house meetings people were not always specific, but wanted to state that they had a general concern about the impact of forest development on fish and wildlife.

Table 4. Ranking of fish and wildlife subjects.

| Rank | Concern | Number of times an issue was raised |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Improved access and over-hunting | 26 |
| 2 | Habitat protection | 16 |
| 3 | Wildlife impacts | 12 |
| 4 | Inventory and management | 9 |
| 5 | Unregulated native hunting | 8 |
| 6 | Fisheries impacts | 5 |
| 6 | Rare and endangered species | 5 |
| 7 | General impacts | 4 |

## Environment

Environmental subjects focussed mostly on water quality related to the pulp mills (Table 5). The Wapiti River was mentioned several times by those expressing concerns related to mill effluents. Downstream communities such as Fort Chipewyan were particularly concerned with water quality, as they feel they will be the recipients of the pollution and reap none of the economic benefits of the proposed development.

Pollution of water and air, which ranked second, is closely related to the concern about water quality. Taken together, emissions from the pulp mills ranked as the most important environmental subject raised at the open houses and public meetings. These concerns came mostly from meetings held in the Grande Prairie, Lac La Biche and Peace River forest districts.

The third-ranked environmental subject related to technology options such as kraft mills vs chemical/thermal/mechanical/ pulping (CTMP), and questions regarding commitments to install new technology as it becomes available.

People were not always specific about their concern for environmental impacts associated with pulp mill development, but did express a fear that impacts would take place. This general concern was raised eight times and, therefore, ranked fourth overall as an environmental concern.

Use of herbicides also ranked fourth, and was usually posed as a question to the company representative. The answer was always that herbicides are not approved for use in forestry applications.

The concern about soil erosion resulting from large-scale forest activities, including clearcutting, and the subsequent impact on a watershed also ranked fourth.

Effects on air quality included concerns related to odour from mills and emission effects on tree growth. The concern related to odour was expressed as a potential negative impact on tourism. This fifth-ranked subject is a component of the broader second ranked subject on air and water pollution.

The protection of ecosystems was ranked sixth and was usually expressed as a request for the protection of natural areas,

Table 5. Ranking of environmental subjects.

| Rank | Concern | Number of times an item was raised |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Water quality related to the pulp mills | 20 |
| 2 | Pollution (air and water) | 10 |
| 3 | Technology options | 9 |
| 4 | General concern for environmental impacts | 8 |
| 4 | Use of herbicides | 8 |
| 4 | Soil erosion | 8 |
| 5 | Effects on air quality | 7 |
| 6 | Protection of ecosystems | 6 |
| 7 | Climate change | 5 |
| 8 | Risk assessment | 1 |
| 8 | Recycling products | 1 |
| 8 | Protection of archaeology and historic sites | 1 |

the declaration of an Heritage River or the protection of existing reserve lands. At the open house at Grovedale it was stated that they want to "retain wildlands for wilderness experience". The concern is also a lifestyle issue, which is the fifth-ranked social and economic subject.

A number of people, mostly in the Grande Prairie Forest District, raised the concern about the removal of forests and its effect on climate change. Air emissions from mills and their contribution to the "greenhouse affect" were also grouped under this seventh-ranked subject.

The last three subjects in Table 5 were raised only once, and are ranked eighth. The issue under risk assessment related to the derailment of a train car containing chlorine. One speaker questioned the need for more pulp mills when paper recycling is not widely practised.

### Social and Economic

Social and economic concerns were grouped under twelve subjects. The top-ranked subject shown in Table 6 relates to the current and future markets for pulp, and the economic return of these projects to Alberta.

People expressed concern that there is too much government investment in an industry that may be at the peak of an economic cycle, and questioned what financial assistance may be required to operate the facilities if the price of pulp declines. The issue is that there are too many tax dollars at risk. Many of the questions related to a concern that the government was not getting a sufficiently high return on the sale of the resource. They questioned the relatively low stumpage rate for hardwoods. One person in Athabasca thought that more jobs could be created in other industries with the same kind of financial incentives from the government, but with fewer environmental impacts.

The employment opportunities were viewed as a beneficial aspect of the expanded forest industry. The expansion of opportunities in the north will mean that people will not be forced to leave the region to find employment. There were concerns about qualifying for jobs, such as

Table 6. Ranking of social and economic subjects.

| Rank | Concern | Number of times an item was raised |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Markets and economic return to Alberta | 14 |
| 2 | Employment opportunities | 13 |
| 2 | Impact of development on trapping | 13 |
| 3 | Native issues and land claims | 12 |
| 4 | Concern regarding foreign ownership of resources | 10 |
| 4 | Agriculture | 10 |
| 5 | General concerns about the quality of life | 6 |
| 6 | Increase in traffic due to log hauling | 5 |
| 7 | Woodlots | 4 |
| 8 | Impact of development on tourism | 3 |
| 9 | Concern for the future of outfitting | 1 |
| 9 | Development effects on recreation | 1 |
| 9 | Concern for aesthetics | 1 |

education levels, but this second-ranked subject was viewed as a positive aspect of the recently announced developments.

Concern regarding the impact of development on trapping also ranked second. These concerns came mostly from meetings in the Athabasca and Lac La Biche forest districts. These concerns were generally expressed for, or by, native trappers, and focussed on the extent of impact and questions regarding compensation. A constructive recommendation made in Anzac was to initiate training programs for displaced trappers in order that they might obtain employment and benefits from the development.

Native issues and land claims ranked third, and were raised mostly in the Athabasca and Slave Lake forest districts. The larger issue of impact of development on traditional lifestyle links directly to concerns regarding trapping. The concern was summed up in a statement made in Fort McKay that the "FMA is blind to native concerns of wildlife management, fisheries conservation and co-management of the resources". Native leaders are looking for meaningful participation in development planning in the north.

The concern about foreign ownership of resources ranked fourth, and came up at meetings in all six forest districts. There is a general discomfort with the large commitment of resources to companies which are mostly foreign owned. People questioned the commitment of Japanese owners to environmental protection in Alberta.

Agricultural concerns also ranked fourth, with half of them coming from meetings in the Grande Prairie Forest District. They included statements regarding the curtailment of further sale of public land for fear that marginal land would be cleared, mostly for the sale of timber. They also included questions about logging grazing leases.

General concerns about quality of life ranked fifth. Comments ranged from broad statements about pulp mills threatening the quality of life in communities, to a specific question on health costs from pollution. Most aspects of the sixth-ranked concern, increased traffic in rural areas, are also quality of life issues.

Comments on both public and private woodlots have been grouped under the seventh-ranked heading of woodlots. These include requests for continued availability of timber to local users from public woodlots. The supply of wood to the pulp mill from private woodlots was of interest in the Lac La Biche forest district.

The impact of forest development on tourism and the loss of revenue from the existing tourist industry was raised at three different meetings, and ranked eighth.

The concern for the future of outfitting, effects of development on recreation and aesthetics were raised only once, and rank ninth on the list of social and economic issues.

### Communication and Consultation

A number of very important subjects have been grouped under the heading of communications and consultation. The top-ranked subject in Table 7 is perceived honesty of government and industry. This includes a wide range of issues from "Government does not reflect appropriate priorities", to "monitoring of effluents and impacts by the companies is suspect".

The concern is linked to the process of negotiating the Forest Management Agreements, and the lack of open participation by the public in the planning process. People have questioned the government and company's commitment to long-term forest management. The inability to answer questions related to environmental protection contributed to the suspicions of people regarding the honesty and commitment of the government in

Table 7. Ranking of communication and consultation subjects

| Rank | Concern | Number of times an item was raised |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Perceived honesty of government and industry | 17 |
| 2 | Public participation in project review | 15 |
| 2 | Positive comments on development | 15 |
| 3 | Request for public hearings on forest projects | 10 |
| 4 | Absence of Alberta Environment at these meetings | 7 |

these matters. The feeling that "everything has been decided" before the public has had an opportunity to examine proposals also contributed to the concern about the honesty of the government and industry.

Many people differentiated between politicians and bureaucrats, and were generally supportive of the work and effort of the government staff. There were questions about why there were no politicians at the meetings.

There were calls for funding of interest groups to conduct their own independent assessments which is indicative of the lack of trust in the work conducted by the companies and in the review conducted by the government agencies. The lack of community input to the studies and review process has resulted in a distrust due to the perception of hastily prepared plans and impact assessments. This is both an issue of honesty and of public participation in project review.

The lack of public involvement was highlighted in Athabasca when one person who lives close to the proposed mill wondered where the data for the socio-economic impact assessment came from, as he had not been consulted.

The request for greater public participation in the review process, the second-ranked subject, came up most frequently at meetings in the Lac La Biche Forest District.

There were a variety of questions on the process leading to the development of a FMA and why there could not be public input. People were told that they would have an opportunity to review the long-term plans, the five year plans and the annual operating plans, but the FMA negotiations are between the government and the company.

Positive comments on development of the forest industry also ranked second. These comments were often voiced by people who work in the industry and view the new developments as an expansion of business or employment opportunities. Positive comments were made at meetings in all forest districts except Athabasca.

The request for public hearings on the mill and forest operation ranked third. Most of these requests were made at meetings in the Lac La Biche Forest District.

The 1979 report of the Environment Council of Alberta recommended a public hearing process for forest development. This report was referenced several times when people asked if public hearings would be called.

Many people came to the meetings with questions on environmental subjects that could not be answered by staff of the Department of Forestry, Land and Wildlife. There were people at meetings in almost all the forest districts that expressed their concern and frustration that there were no representatives from Alberta Environment to answer their questions on

environmental management. This subject ranked fourth.

## Major Issues

In reviewing and summarizing the comments from the series of open houses and public meetings, and the frequency with which they occurred, four issue areas emerge as key public concerns. These are:

- Forest practices,
- Forest Management Agreement process,
- Public participation in decision making, and
- Emissions from plants.

The frequency in which these issues were raised is shown in Table 8. The number of broad issues were repeated at many meetings and were addressed under a variety of subjects. The major issue areas have been determined by grouping related subjects to identify more specifically the principal concerns that emerged from the series of meetings.

The sessions were organized by the Alberta Forest Service, and not surprisingly, they focused on forest management. The public interest in forest practices was significant.

Frequent questions were raised about reforestation, especially concerns about the government's ability to ensure replacement of the forest, timber harvesting techniques, and sustained yield.

A large number of participants expressed dissatisfaction with the FMA process. In particular, topics were raised about the government's approach to planning and the negotiation process. These included specific concerns, such as the number and scale of FMA's, the concentration of timber supply, and that the FMA's were made without the benefit of public input.

It is important to note that the public is concerned about government decision-making. Many individuals lack confidence in the government's performance in this area. Participants stated explicit concerns with the style of decision-making. These included topics such as lack of participation by the public, the need for an integrated review of both the mill and the FMA, and need for an open and credible review process. Many participants felt that the government was not representing their interests.

It is clear that the public feels that plant emissions (air and water) are a major concern. These include subjects such as concern for water quality, and more specifically, relate to topics such as concerns about contamination of drinking water, pollution of rivers, air quality problems, spills of hazardous materials, and the long-term implications of dioxins and furans on human and animal health. This major issue area relates to existing and proposed pulp mills.

The public sentiment on environmental protection, including concerns about better forest management practises and plant emissions, was clearly expressed. That is, the majority of people who attended the sessions put the highest priority on environmental protection.

Table 8. Four major issue areas.

| Rank | Issue | Number of times an item was raised |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Forest Practices | 55 |
| 2 | FMA Process | 48 |
| 3 | Public Participation in Decision Making | 41 |
| 4 | Emissions from Plants | 37 |

# CHAPTER 4

# REVIEW OF BRIEFS SUBMITTED TO PUBLIC MEETINGS

The open house and public meeting process did not encourage written briefs or submissions. However, several organizations took the time to prepare written briefs, and they have been summarized in this chapter. Specifically, the following briefs were received:

1) A Position Paper submitted by the Fort McKay Band.

2) Aboriginal Resource Development Group.

3) Sherwood Park Fish and Game Association.

4) Friends of the Athabasca.

## FORT MCKAY BAND POSITION PAPER

Chief Jim Boucher, on behalf of the Fort McKay Band, made a statement at the April 12, 1989 public meeting in Fort McKay. The Statement contained the following points:

- Deep misgivings about the huge forestry developments which have been approved by the Government of Alberta without consultation with the Aboriginal Resource Development Group (ARDG).

- Disappointment that the public consultation process did not enable the ARDG to speak directly with the Expert Panel members, to see the information provided to the panel, and no control over their final interpretation of ARDG submissions.

- There will not be an Environmental Impact Assessment which deals with the management of the forest resource, or how the FMA will be administered.

- The FMA is "blind to the Native concerns and to the possibility of co-management of the resource". Native Peoples have been precluded from all development and management options.

- There are no plans for Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Office (FEARO) hearings on behalf of Native Peoples.

- The forestry business has only to assess the environmental impacts of the plant sites. The FMA area is not assessed or subject to public review. This system is totally inadequate for this scope, size and scale of development. By contrast, the energy industry is required to submit and consult through a public hearing process conducted by the Energy Resources Conservation Board covering all aspects of their operation.

- These Forestry Agreements will affect hunting and rights of access on Crown land and, therefore, will intrude on Native Peoples Traditional Rights, access to food and sustenance, and will determine the future of animal and fish populations for decades.

- ARDG has not had an opportunity to review the Department's wildlife habitat conservation and protection plans for these projects.

Chief Boucher made the following recommendations:

- The EIA/SIA process must be extended to include all the FMA areas for the identified projects;
- There must be equivalency in the EIA processes applied to the energy and forest industries with opportunities for public hearings;
- Indian lands, Crown jurisdiction and land access and management issues must be settled before approvals are issued;
- There must be provision for joint management of forestry, wildlife, and fisheries between the Native People, the government and developers.
- There must be meaningful participation of Native interests in the development and issuance of the Forest Management Agreements.

## ABORIGINAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT GROUP POSITION PAPER

Chief Jim Boucher, Fort McKay Band, tabled a Position Paper entitled "Aboriginal People of Northern Alberta and Forest Management Agreements - Issues and Concerns". This Position Paper was prepared by the Aboriginal Resources Development Group (ARDG).

The ARDG identified the following issues and made recommendations:

### Impact on Fish and Wildlife

There is either very limited, or no baseline data regarding fisheries and wildlife populations in the FMA areas. Consequently, it will be almost impossible to scientifically and objectively assess in the future whether proposed logging practices have impacted fisheries and wildlife habitat and populations following the commencement of logging.

ARDG Recommended that:

- The FMA require the company to undertake, through the ARDG, an independent, thorough and proper fisheries and wildlife inventory over the FMA area.
- The goal and objective for fish and wildlife management within any FMA area should be a "no net loss" and, if possible, an increase of wildlife and habitat through mitigation, conservation and restoration of prime fish and wildlife habitat in the area.

### General Development Plans, Annual Operating Plans - Consultation and Joint Management

There is limited opportunity for consistent, effective public input into FMA general development plans (GDP), annual operating plans (AOP) and the ground rules, particularly for Aboriginal land users. The ARDG requested a mechanism be put in place to ensure full, effective and timely Aboriginal input into these plans. This mechanism would ensure that the interests of the Aboriginal people in the resource base of wildlife will be maintained. Consultation costs to be borne by the proponent.

The ARDG recommended that:

The FMA require the company and the Department to meet annually, or as required, with the ARDG, adjacent Native Communities and impacted Aboriginal trappers and hunters to review the GDP and AOP from an aboriginal perspective prior to their approval by the Department.

### Environmental Mitigation Technology

The ARDG referred to some FMA's which require the company to adopt technologies that are "reasonably economic" to meet compliance requirements of the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts. The ARDG and its member Aboriginal Communities must be satisfied that the FMA and Alberta Environment licence requires the company to use the best available technology and other mitigative measures.

The ARDG will seek to work directly with Alberta Environment and the companies to review the terms and conditions of any licences issued to the proponents within their area.

The ARDG recommended that:

- As part of the FMA, Alberta Environment require companies to use the "best available technology" to mitigate air and water emissions from their plants and mills.

- Alberta Environment have input into the terms of the FMA to avoid any clauses in the FMA (such as price) which would compromise their negotiations or licencing standards and technological requirements.

### Access to FMA Harvest Areas

A primary concern to Native people will be the increased access of non-Aboriginal people to the FMA as a result of the roads constructed into the area. The question appears to be one of limiting access, or developing an acceptable plan of restricting hunting and fishing in the area, that does not impede the exercise of Aboriginal or Treaty Rights.

ARDG recommended that:

> A Wildlife Management Committee be struck for each FMA to consist of representatives of ARDG and the Department to develop policies governing access to the area for hunting purposes.

### Protection of Treaty Rights

Treaty 8 and the Natural Resources Transfer Act allows Indian people to hunt where they have access to unoccupied Crown lands. There is no specific mention in the FMA of allowing Treaty Indians access to the FMA to exercise Treaty rights. It is unclear as to whether lands set aside as FMA are no longer "unoccupied Crown lands" and therefore, not available for exercising of Treaty hunting rights. The ARDG wishes to receive assurances from the Premier that the Province will not designate FMA "occupied Crown land" for the purpose of limiting or excluding the exercise of Treaty rights.

The ARDG recommended that:

> The Alberta Government insist upon a clause being included in FMA's to the effect that the FMA does not constitute an occupation of Crown Lands and the lands therefore remain accessible to Treaty Indians for the exercising of Treaty rights regarding hunting, fishing and trapping.

### Trapline Compensation

There is no government policy requiring the company to provide compensation to trappers from the impact of FMA's and forestry projects. The Trappers Compensation Board has no jurisdiction on forestry projects.

The ARDG recommended that:

- A clause be included in the FMA to the effect that the company should provide full, fair and equitable compensation (for a variety of types of losses) to any trapper or Aboriginal land user whose trapline, income or food supply is impacted by the operations of the

company, and that provision be made for a three-man panel to resolve unsettled claims.

- If the parties cannot agree on a policy, appropriate legislation be adopted to address the compensation issue.

### Socio-Economic Benefits - Native Employment, Training and Contracting

One of the stated purposes of the FMA is to ensure a "stable local community". The company should annually submit, as part of the AOP, a report on recruitment, employment, training and contracting of Native people.

ARDG recommended that:

- The FMA place a specific obligation on the proponent to develop local native training, employment, and contracting policies, practices and procedures, preferably by an agreement between the company, government and the ARDG.

### Aboriginal Community - Managed Forests

The ARDG and some of its members are of the view that expansion of the community forest concept would go far in alleviating community concerns. Only residents of a defined community would be eligible for timber permits from the community forest. A community forest, excluded from the FMA, with tenure in an Indian Band, Metis Settlement, or community corporation would place the responsibility for sound forest management in the hands of community concerns.

The member bands of the ARDG wish to secure certain portions of the forest adjacent to their communities for their own use and have them excluded from FMA's.

### FMA and Land Claims

The FMA's do not specifically allow for withdrawal of lands to enable the Alberta Government to meet their obligations to provide lands selected by the band to be set aside as a reserve to meet outstanding federal land claim obligations under Treaty.

The ARDG recommended that the FMA's contain clauses to the following effect:

- The Alberta Government and the company specifically recognize and acknowledge that granting of an FMA does not constitute occupied Crown lands and, therefore, are available to Bands and Canada to select lands to settle outstanding Treaty land entitlement.

- The Minister may withdraw from any FMA those lands selected by an Indian Band and Canada for the purposes of meeting Canada's outstanding Treaty obligations. Neither Alberta, Canada nor the Band shall be required to provide the company any compensation for land so removed.

### Company - Aboriginal Relations

The ARDG recommended that:

- Company management staff and contractors be required to take an ARDG-prepared seminar in native awareness and cross-culture training;

- Company management staff visit impacted Native communities with ARDG to discuss Aboriginal concerns and ambitions;

- Sufficient funding be made available to the ARDG to enable it to undertake an active role in initiating and maintaining dialogue with companies.

## GOVERNMENT RESPONSES

The Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, and Department staff have responded to Chief Boucher and the Aboriginal Resource Development Group. Many of the issues summarized above are the subject of on-going correspondence and negotiations.

## SHERWOOD PARK FISH AND GAME ASSOCIATION

The Association presented a four-page position paper to the April 25, 1989 public meeting in Athabasca. The Association emphasized that it is not anti-development, but it has a strong commitment to protect wildlife and its habitat.

In the interest of finding a balance between commercial forest development and the protection of wildlife habitat, the Association raised the following concerns:

### Improved Cooperation Between the Forestry and Wildlife Branches

If adequate consideration of wildlife concerns is given at the early planning stage, many potential conflicts and problems can be avoided. The position paper specifically referred to the Alberta Timber Harvest Planning and Operating Ground Rules, whereby Fish and Wildlife concerns are to be reported to the Forest Service at least 5 years in advance of cutting. The Association questioned how this requirement could be met in the absence of basic wildlife population data.

### Public Input

To date, public input on forest development has been superficial despite the public's interest in providing such input, as reported in the 1979 Environmental Council report. The Association expressed concern that no provision was made for public input from areas outside the immediate mill site.

### Responsible Forest Harvesting Methods

The Association suggested consideration of: 3 or 4 stage harvesting schedule; sizeable areas of old growth forest should be allowed to mature; cut blocks as small (and narrow) as practical; identification and protection of important wildlife habitat; the use of "high flotation" logging equipment; and, design and maintenance of haul roads to reduce the number of vehicle/animal collisions.

### The Hardwood and Mixedwood Resource

Forestry policies and regulations must adequately protect the mixedwood resource, and the following issues must be addressed: coordination and cooperative harvesting efforts; uneven regeneration time between hardwood and softwood species; damage to coniferous understory when aspen is harvested; and what species should be replanted after clearcutting of mixedwood stands. The paper also identified the need for a better understanding of natural mixedwood succession and the role it plays in providing habitat.

### Enforcement of Regulations

Existing regulations seem adequate to help protect the forest environment from serious negative impacts of logging operations. Too often these ground rules are only used as guidelines and are not enforceable due to weak wording. These "Ground Rules" must be strengthened to ensure that operators carry out their work in an environmentally-sound manner, with significant penalties for violations, and adequate numbers of forestry staff to assure compliance.

### Intensive Forest Development

Intensive silviculture techniques must be carefully controlled to avoid unacceptable impacts on habitat. Concerns were raised about the impact on habitat of: the use of herbicides; growth regulators and fertilizers; drainage of wetlands to encourage growth of commercial timber; and, the use of genetic engineering or introduction of exotic species.

### Access

Some method must be found to offset and control easy access provided by logging roads: to minimize disturbance, increased poaching, and increased hunter success, which together will add significantly to pressures on wildlife populations. The position paper also raised the question of whether year-round operation of logging roads is necessary.

### Cumulative Effect of Several Major Projects

Consideration must be given to the total impact of all these developments which will accrue simultaneously.

It is imperative that the best technology be used to ensure pollution is kept to a minimum. The position paper suggested that consumers will find the paper products made from the thermal-mechanical process more acceptable, and as a result demand for kraft paper products will fall in the near future. Therefore, a long-term commitment to kraft mills may prove to be a mistake.

## FRIENDS OF THE ATHABASCA

Four separate written submissions were made by Friends of the Athabasca (FOTA), including:

- A message from Friends of the Athabasca.
- A paper submitted to the public meeting April 25, 1989 in Athabasca by William A. Fuller, Professor Emeritus, Zoology, University of Alberta.
- A paper submitted by Everett B. Peterson R.P.F. at the May 2, 1989 public meeting in Grand Centre.
- Forestry-related recommendations submitted by FOTA - Dr. William A Fuller, at Grand Centre.

PUBLIC MEETING IN ATHABASCA

### A Message From Friends of the Athabasca

The submission was presented by Louis Schmittroth, and stated that many recommendations contained in the 1979 Environment Council of Alberta (ECA) public review of forestry policies in Alberta have not been implemented.

Specifically, wildlife habitat, wilderness designation, public participation, environmental quality, and policy development/revision, have been ignored. i.e., Forest Management Agreements (recommendations No.38); Future development (No. 57); Fish management (Nos. 65 and 66); Wildlife management (No. 67); on specifically designated lands (No. 89); Wild Lands and Wilderness areas (Nos. 92 and 93); and, Eastern Slopes (Nos. 127 and 128).

The submission urged comparison of ECA recommendation No. 38 regarding Forest Management Agreements, with the approach taken in the recent Daishawa and Crestbrook FMA's.

Speaking on behalf of the Friends of the Athabasca, Dr. William Fuller presented a paper based on a 1988 Symposium on "Management and Utilization of Northern Mixedwood"[1], held in Edmonton. Extracts were taken from presentations by representatives from: Alberta Forestry, Lands and Wildlife; Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources; Saskatchewan Department of Parks Recreation and Culture; Canadian Forestry Service; Weyerhaeuser and Proctor and Gamble; and, the Faculty of Forestry, University of Alberta.

The extracts were summarized under three major headings:

**Forest Management**

Dr. Fuller quoted from a number of sources relating to forest management of boreal mixedwood forests on several subjects including: inventory data, silviculture, harvest systems, and regeneration.

Dr. Fuller concluded:

- That neither Ontario to Northwestern B.C. has yet demonstrated a good job of managing mixedwood forests; and
- There is a pressing need for any proponent to have experts in forest ecology and silviculture, not just experts in cutting trees.

**Wildlife Management**

Again Dr. Fuller quoted from a number of Symposium sources and raised questions concerning: involvement of wildlife biologists in decisions regarding need for a proper balance of mixedwood stands; application of repellant products; reserving productive forest land for other uses; cutover sizes and patterns; and questions regarding caribou, cavity nesters, furbearers, wildlife inventory, and wildlife managers on proponent's staff.

**Public Involvement**

Dr. Fuller referred to quotations from the Symposium relating to the need for a broader mix of people involved when trying to set objectives for management in boreal mixedwood forests; the need for public support for objectives; social and cultural acceptability, or involving in our management planning those affected by government decisions.

PUBLIC MEETING IN GRAND CENTRE

Mr. Everett B. Peterson R.P.F., speaking on behalf of the Friends of the Athabasca, presented a paper which focused on concerns about the ability to manage boreal mixed forest in a sustainable manner, and that forest management in northeastern Alberta must involve management of the water table.

The paper covered a number of concerns about management of boreal mixed forests relating to:

- forest inventory data,
- forest regeneration,
- planning sustained yield operations,
- silviculture,
- logging operations,
- use of herbicides,
- wildlife management, and
- ecological effects.

Dr. William Fuller submitted a set of recommendations on behalf of the Friends of the Athabasca Environmental Association. The recommendations were:

- Manage the forest in such a way that boreal mixedwood is not allowed to become boreal hardwood.

[1] The Symposium was called to examine and address the emerging issues and opportunities surrounding northern mixedwood management and utilization.

- In order to manage the wildlife resources, the proponent should have a full-time professional staff of wildlife biologists.

- In order to manage the forest resources, the proponent should have a full-time professional staff of forest ecologists and silviculturists.

- Management of regeneration must be intensive, rather than extensive. Intensive management is relatively labor-intensive, thereby creating more local jobs for relatively unskilled workers.

- The proponents should establish a tree nursery in the region of the FMA to produce spruce seedlings that will be required.

- The public must be reassured that the forest industry is truly adequate.

- There must be an iron-clad requirement for wildlife inventories in any agreement.

- Areas of special significance for tourist and recreational potential must be identified and included in the management phase.

- Historical and heritage resources in the proposed FMA must be preserved.

- There should be no difficulty in defining several large Ecological Reserves in the FMA.

- The maintenance of a reasonable proportion of the FMA in old-growth forests must be guaranteed in the FMA.

- Cut blocks should be designed to maximize edge, and should be as small as practical (not larger than 40 ha).

- The rules in the FMA must guarantee that reserve blocks not be cut until wildlife species have adequate cover.

- Stumpage must reflect the new status of aspen as the "Cinderella" tree, and the cost of protecting the forest.

- Holders of Registered Trapping Areas should be given more consideration than the proponent seems to be prepared to give.

- There must be an iron-clad guarantee, backed by a substantial performance bond, that a paper plant and a sheeter plant will, in fact, be built at the earliest possible time.

- There should be public input into the negotiations and the subsequent management plans.

Dr. Fuller included a brief submission relating to stumpage charges for aspen for the proposed Alberta Pacific kraft mill, and questioned whether such charges are fair to the owners of the resource.

Dr. Fuller also included a brief submission relating to ecological reserves in FMA's. He raised the question: is it not possible to insist that several township-sized ecological reserves be set aside under authority of the FMA?

# CHAPTER 5

# MEDIA SCANNING

## INTRODUCTION

Issues related to northern forestry developments raised in the print media were identified by monitoring newspapers over a 12-month period (June, 1988 to May, 1989). A total of 10 provincial and national, and 27 local and regional (northern Alberta) newspapers were scanned. These are shown in Table 9, grouped according to forest districts.

A data base of newspaper articles, editorials, and letters to editors has been assembled. Different sampling techniques used by different clipping services, however, have resulted in inconsistencies in the data base for some sources and some time periods. Therefore, the data cannot be subjected to statistical analysis.

## ASSESSMENT OF MEDIA ISSUES

The 807 clippings included 620 articles, 169 letters and 18 editorials. Their breakdown according to forest district is presented in Table 10. The Grande Prairie (34), Lac La Biche (33), Peace River (31), Slave Lake (42) and Whitecourt (18) forest districts each had a small number of clippings as compared to the Athabasca district (162), provincial and national sources (361) and unidentified sources (127). The small samples in five of the six forest districts limited meaningful analysis within these districts, and comparison among districts. As well, four out of the five forest districts had no editorials, and three had no letters to the editor.

Taking into account the limitations of the sampling techniques, the media monitoring provided an excellent gauge of media coverage on issues relating to northern forestry development. It appears to be a relatively accurate indicator of the public mood, and is supported by findings from the questionnaires filled out at the public meetings and the questions raised at the open houses and public meetings.

The seventeen key words used to code clippings are shown in Table 11.

Frequencies with which key words appear in clippings within each forest district, the provincial/national category, unidentified sources and all sources are shown in the Media Scanning Key Words Matrix (Appendix D). The rankings of key words totalled for all sources is provided in Table 12. Table 13 gives the key word rankings for each forest district, the provincial and national category and those with unidentified sources.

### Pulp

The overwhelming issue raised in the print media are the pulp mills at 693 mentions. The key word "pulp" was assigned to any clipping that refers to pulp mills. In every forest district, as well as the provincial and national and unidentified source categories, pulp mill issues rank number one. The majority of clippings prior to January, 1989 related to rumours about negotiations for major pulp mill developments in northern Alberta, and were followed by the actual announcements. These began with the Daishowa mill in Peace River in June, 1988, and ended with the Proctor and Gamble mill in Grande Prairie in January, 1989. Since January, while pulp mills continue to receive a high amount of media attention, the focus has shifted to the implications of these developments on Alberta's environment and economy.

Table 9. Newspapers Scanned by Forest District.

ATHABASCA (AT)
Athabasca Advocate
Athabasca Advertiser
Fort McMurray Express
Fort McMurray Today

GRANDE PRAIRIE (GP)
Grande Prairie Herald
Central Peace Signal
Valleyview Valley News

LAC LA BICHE (LL)
Lac La Biche Post
Redwater Tribune
Smoky Lake Signal

PEACE RIVER (PR)
Fairview Post
Grimshaw Mile Zero News
Manning Banner Post
Mackenzie Highway News
Peace River Record Gazette
Smoky River Express

WHITECOURT (WT)
Barrhead Leader
Mayerthorpe Free Lancer
Whitecourt Star

PROVINCIAL/NATIONAL (PN)
Alberta Native News
Alberta Report
Calgary Sun
Calgary Herald
Edmonton Sun
Edmonton Journal
Globe & Mail
Environmental Review
The Financial Report
Windspeaker

SLAVE LAKE (SL)
High Prairie Mirror
High Prairie South Peace News
Slave Lake Lakeside Leader
Slave Lake Scope
Town & Country
Westlock Hub
Westlock News

Table 10. Breakdown of Letters, Editorials and Articles by Forest District.

| | AT | GP | LL | PR | SL | WT | PN | UI | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LETTER | 67 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 42 | 169 |
| EDITORIAL | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 18 |
| ARTICLES | 94 | 33 | 28 | 31 | 42 | 13 | 295 | 84 | 620 |
| TOTAL | 162 | 34 | 33 | 31 | 42 | 18 | 361 | 126 | 807 |

AT= Athabasca; GP = Grande Prairie; LL = Lac La Biche; PR = Peace River; WT = Whitecourt; PN = Provincial/National; UI = Unidentified

Table 11. Media Scanning Key Words.

Public (PUB) - public opinion, public action, public consultation, public meetings, public forums
Forest Management Agreements (FMA) - forest management agreements, negotiations between governments, terms of agreements
Forest Practices (FOP) - logging, clearcutting, reforestation
Pulp Mills (PULP) - announcements, siting, environmental impacts, economic implications
Native (NAT) - native peoples, land claims, treaty rights
Government (GOV) - announcements, statements, policy, decision- making, planning process, regulations, fines, reactions
Fish (FIS) - fisheries impacts
Wildlife (WIL) - wildlife impacts
Water (WAT) - water quality, dioxins, pollution of rivers, furans, kraft mill effluents
Air (AIR) - emissions, weather modifications
Land (LAN) - transportation
Technology (TEC) - technological advances and options
Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) - need for EIA, requirements, scope, jurisdiction, responsible agencies
Public Use (PUU) - recreation, access
Pollution (POL) - general pollution issues
Safety (SAF) - health and safety
Benefits (BEN) - economic spinoffs, employment, economic growth

Table 12. Overall Ranking of Key Words.

| RANK | KEY WORD | # |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Pulp | 693 |
| 2. | Public | 308 |
| 3. | Government | 303 |
| 4. | EIA | 170 |
| 5. | Water | 161 |
| 6. | Benefits | 153 |
| 7. | Forest Practices | 115 |
| 8. | Pollution | 113 |
| 9. | FMA | 86 |
| 10. | Safety | 76 |
| 11. | Technology | 75 |
| 12. | Wildlife | 62 |
| 13. | Fish | 41 |
| 13. | Native | 41 |
| 14. | Air | 39 |
| 14. | Public Use | 39 |
| 15. | Land | 32 |

Table 13. Ranking of Key Words by Forest District.

| | AT | GP | LL | PR | SL | WT | PN | UI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PULP | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| PUBLIC | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | - | 3 | 2 |
| GOVERNMENT | 6 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 11 |
| EIA | 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 6 | - | 5 | 5 |
| WATER | 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| BENEFITS | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| FOREST PRACTICES | 14 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| POLLUTION | 7 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 7 |
| FMA | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 9 |
| SAFETY | 8 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 9 | 10 |
| TECHNOLOGY | 11 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 11 | 9 |
| WILDLIFE | 10 | 7 | 10 | 7 | - | - | 13 | 6 |
| FISH | 16 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 10 | - | 14 | 8 |
| NATIVE | 13 | - | 8 | 9 | - | - | 12 | 13 |
| AIR | 12 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | - | 17 | 8 |
| PUBLIC USE | 14 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | - | 15 | 9 |
| LAND | 15 | 7 | 9 | 5 | - | - | 16 | 13 |

AT= Athabasca; GP = Grande Prairie; LL = Lac La Biche; PR = Peace River; WT = Whitecourt; PN = Provincial/National; UI = Unidentified

It is noteworthy that all the clippings that address the issue of pulp mills also address issues such as government decision making, public input, water pollution, and local benefits.

### Public

Public opinion, public action, public forums and public consultation, or the lack thereof, rank second overall and within the top five in all forest districts. The key word "public" was assigned to these clippings. Content focuses on public concerns over the environmental and long-term economic implications of the forest developments. The process(es) the government used, or did not use, to hear and address public concerns also appears.

Initially, clippings in this category were primarily contained in the local/regional papers. As public concern grew over the style of government decision making and the number of projects that were announced, provincial and national papers also raised these public-based concerns with increasing frequency. These issues further escalated once the question of possible federal government involvement was raised in April of 1989.

Through the period of this survey it was possible to track the rise of local and regional citizen advocacy groups, such as Friends of the Athabasca, that were created in response to the project announcements and lack of public input into the decision-making process. Many of the clippings that focused on public issues also tended to support the need for more public input and full public review of forestry projects.

### Government

Clippings which dealt with government rank third overall, and within the top six in all forest districts. The key word "government" was assigned to clippings that mentioned government

announcements, policy, style of decision-making, planning process and regulations. Statements and actions by elected officials (including opposition critics), and civil servants were also included. During September, 1988 through early January, 1989, clippings in this category reported primarily on government negotiations and agreements with industry. Following the announcements of the forest management agreements, the focus of the clippings in this category shifted to government decision-making process and regulation of industry.

Many of the clippings were critical of government secrecy and its closed-door style of decision-making. Moreover, many of the clippings stated that the government did not get a "good deal" for Albertans. A significant number of the clippings also suggested that government should be taking a leadership role in regulating industry, but they concluded it is not.

### Environmental Impact Assessment

Ranking fourth overall was environmental impact assessment (EIA). Most clippings assigned this key word referred to the need for more comprehensive, independent EIA's on all aspects of forestry developments. Clippings on this topic first appeared in November, 1988 and increased through to May, 1989. They appeared mainly in provincial and national newspapers. Contents of these clippings suggest a desire for environmental assessments to encompass all aspects of the forestry developments - from forest management areas to pulp mills - and subject to full public review. Public hearings were proposed as a mechanism for addressing public concerns about the environmental impact assessments. Most of the clippings that addressed the subject of EIA's also tended to focus on the need for more public input into government decision making.

### Water

Water ranked fifth overall. Clippings in this category dealt primarily with pollution of rivers by existing and proposed pulp mills. Clippings on water appeared consistently throughout the sampling time frame, and were raised equally in the local/regional and provincial/national papers. Clippings' content included deterioration of water quality downstream of pulp mills, production of dioxins and furans by kraft pulp mills, hazards to human health, toxicity to fish, effects of herbicide use in the forestry industry on water quality and the inter-jurisdictional nature of water quality issues.

Further analysis of the clippings that focused on water reveal that one of the features Albertans have taken pride in is their water. Thus, measures to enhance the protection of water quality are considered essential by the public, and they do not want them compromised for economic growth. Thus, basic issues such as safe drinking water, viability of commercial fisheries and long-term health implications from pulp mill effluents tended to be of great concern. It was made clear in all these clippings that environmental protection is now directly related to the issue of public health.

### Economic Benefits

Economic benefits were the sixth most frequently mentioned topic. Clippings assigned this key word were generally positive towards the forestry developments and cited economic stimulation, regional development and local employment. The large majority of clippings on this topic were from local and regional sources, with little mention in national and provincial media. It is noteworthy that, while benefits were an important consideration in local/regional areas, they rank well behind several environmental and public involvement concerns. As importantly, the clippings reveal that many Albertans feel both a strong economy and a clean environment can co-exist.

## Forest Practices

Forest practices ranked seventh overall. The key word "forest practices" was assigned to clippings which referred to reforestation, harvesting techniques, and herbicide use. Most of the clippings which addressed forest practices raised the issue that there are not enough trees being planted to replenish logged areas, and that the government's approach to sustained yield is not working. Those clippings that focused on potential herbicide use also were strongly linked to issues of human health and water.

## Other Topics

The key word "pollution" ranked eighth overall, and was used when pollution was mentioned in a general sense, but did not make mention of specific concerns like water or air.

The key word "FMA" referred to those clippings that mentioned forest management agreements, and was often used in conjunction with the government key word. FMA placed ninth in the overall ranking.

Safety referred to those clips mentioning health and safety issues, and was ranked tenth overall. Most clippings focusing on health and safety also referred to water quality and reflect the fear among the general public of not only the known hazards, but perhaps, more importantly, the unknown.

Technology ranked eleventh overall and was used to identify clippings that referred to any type of technology involved in the forestry area such as kraft mill technology or bleaching procedures. Many of the clippings suggest that Albertans believe that technology exists to minimize environmental impacts. Concerns were expressed in a number of clippings that the Alberta Government does not require the use of state-of-the-art technology by pulp mills, especially in relation to effluent treatment.

Wildlife and Fish were ranked twelfth and thirteenth respectively. These two key words are self-explanatory. Both had especially low rankings within the Whitecourt Forest District.

The key word "native" was used when a clip mentioned native people being involved. Native had an overall ranking of thirteenth. Topics in this category include disposition of timber rights on Indian lands, land claims, impacts and benefits to native people. The majority of the clippings reflect a concern about the impacts of pulp mills on native people, and the need to settle land claims before assigning timber rights.

Ranked fourteenth was air and public use. Air was used in conjunction with clippings that referred to air quality or emissions. This low ranking demonstrates that in relation to pulp mills, water is the key issue more so than air. Public Use was used when recreation issues were used. Again, the low ranking denotes that this in not a major concern.

Ranked fifteenth is "Land". This key word was used when transportation issues were raised.

# CHAPTER 6

# QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

## INTRODUCTION

Responses to a questionnaire designed and distributed by Forestry, Lands and Wildlife at the information sessions are presented and analyzed. In total, 352 questionnaires were filled out and returned by those attending the sessions. A sample of the questionnaire is included in Appendix D.

The first question asked respondents to identify their concerns regarding forest resource use in the area. The remaining five questions asked people's impressions of various aspects of the public information sessions.

In reviewing questionnaire results it is also important to keep in mind that the open houses and public meetings were designed to convey information on forest resource use (administered by Forestry Lands and Wildlife), and did not specifically address other issues, such as the environmental implications of pulp mill developments which are the responsibility of Alberta Environment.

## ASSESSMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRES

### Concerns Regarding Forest Resource Use

*Question 1: What concerns do you have regarding forest resource use in this area?*

Frequencies with which a particular concern was identified within each forest district, and for all districts, were calculated and the data are presented on the matrix tables in Appendix E. The Whitecourt (7), Athabasca (13) and Lac La Biche (23) forest districts have very small sample sizes which makes meaningful analysis and comparison difficult. Peace River (129), Grande Praire (108) and Slave Lake (72) have much larger, and therefore, more representative samples.

The ranking of concerns for all questionnaires is provided in Table 14. Ranking within each of the six forest districts is provided in Table 15.

Within the sample, and even given the inadequacy of the data base, the overwhelming public concern is the need for adequate reforestation to ensure that forests are available for future generations. This subject ranks highest in all forest districts with the exception of Athabasca.

The public issue which ranked number two overall, and also measures well above all other concerns, is the impact of the proposed developments on wildlife, specifically land-based wildlife. This concern ranked number one in Athabasca, tied for number one in Lac La Biche, ranked number two in Peace River, Slave Lake and Whitecourt and number three in Grande Prairie. Associated with this issue was a concern about the Fish and Wildlife Division's ability to monitor wildlife populations and enforce regulations to protect wildlife. This concern ranked tenth, followed in eleventh rank by a concern about the project's impact on trapping, and, in twelfth rank by a general concern about development impacts on fish and wildlife.

Concern over water quality, primarily the health of rivers which receive effluents from pulp mills, ranked number three overall. While the general public may distinguish that the management of water quality is not within the mandate of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, they view pollution of rivers as a major impact resulting from pulp mills, and many respondents stated that the government is

not taking action. Concern over water quality tied for number one in the Athabasca Forest District, and ranked number two in Grande Prairie. The concern for clean water overlapped with the next subject, pollution of air and water, which is a more general concern raised by the public.

Pollution of air and water ranked as the number four overall public issue. Respondents in this category either stated a concern for both air and water pollution, or pollution generally. As with the previous subject areas, many people were concerned that major forest developments have implications for air and water quality. When asked for their evaluation of the sessions, several respondents expressed frustration that experts who could answer their questions about pulp mills and pollution were not present at the open houses and public meetings.

Three concerns tied for number five: 1) general environmental issues which were not specifically identified; 2) harvesting techniques which included such matters as cut-block design and proportion of area logged; and 3) disposition of timber to large multinationals instead of smaller, local firms already operating in the area.

Preservation of ecosystems, including protecting old-growth forests, establishing parks and natural areas, and providing buffers along streams and rivers and around lakes ranked sixth. Concerns about soil erosion, which is associated with the above issue, as well as with the issue of protecting water quality, ranked seventh.

Sixty questionnaires had no response to question one. Seventeen respondents stated that they had no concerns regarding forest resource use in the area and/or felt positive about the developments.

In reviewing the questionnaires, it is noteworthy that eleven of the twelve concerns in the top ten rankings focussed on environmental and forest management issues. Only one socio-economic concern, quality of life (which includes concerns for retaining lifestyle and aesthetics), ranked eighth. Moreover, all of the above ranked ahead of a concern for local employment, which ranked eleventh.

Public communication and consultation subjects ranked thirteenth and fourteenth. It should be noted that these are also part of the concern over timber disposition. Respondents identifying this as a concern felt that timber had been arbitrarily allocated to large multinational companies without due consideration for, or consultation with, smaller companies already operating in the area or the general public. Concerns about public communication and consultation also arose in responses to questions 2 to 6.

## Impressions of the Meeting

The responses to questions 2 through 6 reflected the public's eagerness to have a forum where they can review information, ask questions and make their concerns known. The general tone of the responses was that people were pleased with the forum, even though not all of their concerns were addressed, and that they would like to have further opportunities for consultation and communication. The comments on the questionnaires tended to suggest that the respondents were concerned that the government is not adequately looking after their interests.

*Question 2: Did this meeting provide you with the information you were seeking?*

A majority of respondents felt the meeting provided them with the information which they were seeking (Table 16). This majority was marginal in the meetings held in the Athabasca and Lac La Biche forest districts, which had very few questionnaires returned. Respondents seemed confused by this question. Although many responded positively to having been provided information, many also went on to identify concerns which they still have such as pollution,

Table 4. Rank of Concerns for all Questionnaires Based on Responses to Question One. (Total number of questionnaires was 352.)

| Rank | Concern | Number of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Reforestation and Sustained Yield | 101 |
| 2 | Impacts on Wildlife (land-based) | 52 |
| 3 | Water Quality in Rivers | 33 |
| 4 | Pollution of Water and Air | 23 |
| 5 | General Environmental Concerns | 22 |
| 5 | Disposition of Timber | 22 |
| 5 | Harvest Techniques (cut-block size) | 22 |
| 6 | Preservation of Ecosystems (includes buffers) | 19 |
| 7 | Soil Erosion | 15 |
| 8 | Quality of Life (includes aesthetics) | 14 |
| 9 | Monitoring and Enforcement | 13 |
| 10 | Inventory and Management of Fish & Wildlife | 12 |
| 11 | Local Employment | 10 |
| 11 | Economic Return to Alberta and Canada | 10 |
| 11 | Trapping | 8 |
| 12 | General Impacts on Fish and Wildlife | 8 |
| 12 | Climate Change | 8 |
| 13 | Access Control | 6 |
| 13 | Agriculture (conversion) | 6 |
| 13 | Public Participation | 6 |
| 14 | Public Awareness | 5 |
| 15 | Herbicides | 4 |
| 15 | Perceived Honesty of Government Agencies | 4 |
| 15 | Transportation | 4 |
| 16 | Big Game Outfitting | 3 |
| 16 | Rare and Endangered Species (caribou) | 3 |
| 17 | Integrated Resource Planning (multiple use) | 2 |
| 17 | Air Quality | 2 |
| 17 | Fisheries Impacts | 2 |
| 18 | Interjurisdictional Impacts (extraprovincial) | 1 |
| 18 | Emergency Response | 1 |
| 18 | Technology Options (recycling) | 1 |
| 18 | Tourism | 1 |
| 18 | FMA Planning | 1 |
| 18 | Environmental Impact Assessment | 1 |
| 18 | Public Hearings on Forest Projects | 1 |

Table 15. Rank of Concerns by Forest District Based on Responses to Question One.

| Concern | Rank within Forest Districts | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AT | GP | LL | PR | SL | WT |
| Reforestation and Sustainable Yield | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Wildlife Impacts (land-based) | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Water Quality in Rivers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | - |
| Pollution of Water and Air | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 | - |
| General Environmental Concerns | - | 5 | - | 3 | 3 | - |
| Disposition of Timber | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 | - |
| Harvest Techniques (cut-block size) | - | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | - |
| Preservation of Ecosystems (includes buffers) | - | 4 | - | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| Soil Erosion | - | 8 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| Quality of Life | 3 | 9 | - | 5 | 4 | - |
| Monitoring and Enforcement | 3 | 6 | 2 | - | 4 | - |
| Inventory and Management of Fish & Wildlife | 3 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 7 | - |
| Local Employment | - | 10 | 4 | 5 | 7 | - |
| Economic Return to Alberta and Canada | - | 10 | - | 7 | 5 | 3 |
| Trapping | 2 | 8 | 4 | 9 | - | - |
| General Impacts on Fish and Wildlife | 3 | 9 | - | 8 | 7 | - |
| Climate Change | - | 10 | 2 | - | 6 | - |
| Access Control | - | 9 | - | 9 | 6 | - |
| Agriculture (conversion) | - | 9 | - | 8 | - | - |
| Public Participation | 3 | - | 3 | 9 | 7 | - |
| Public Awareness | - | 7 | - | 10 | - | - |
| Herbicides | - | 9 | - | - | 6 | - |
| Perceived Honesty of Government Agencies | - | 10 | 4 | 10 | 7 | - |
| Transportation | - | - | - | 9 | 6 | - |
| Big Game Outfitting | - | 9 | - | 10 | - | - |
| Rare and Endangered Species (caribou) | 2 | 10 | - | - | - | - |
| Integrated Resource Planning (multiple use) | - | 9 | - | - | - | - |
| Air Quality | - | - | 4 | 10 | - | - |
| Fisheries Impacts | - | - | - | 9 | - | - |
| Interjurisdictional Impacts (extraprovincial) | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Emergency Response | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Technology Options (recycling) | - | - | 4 | - | - | - |
| Tourism | - | - | - | 10 | - | - |
| FMA Planning | - | - | 4 | - | - | - |
| Environmental Impact Assessment | - | - | 4 | - | - | - |
| Public Hearings on Forest Projects | - | - | - | - | 7 | - |

AT = Athabasca; GP = Grande Praire; LL = Lac La Biche; PR = Peace River; SL = Slave Lake; WT = Whitecourt

Table 16. Question 2: Did This Meeting Provide You With the Information You Were Seeking?

| Response | Number of Responses | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AT | GP | LL | PR | SL | WT | TOTAL |
| Yes | 6 | 90 | 9 | 100 | 51 | 5 | 261 |
| No | 5 | 9 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 46 |
| Undecided | 0 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 24 |
| No Response | 2 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 21 |

reforestation and government information and decision making.

*Question 3: Did you find the speakers to be informed and open to your comments?*

A large majority of respondents at all meetings in all districts answered "yes" to this question (Table 17). Many people went on to provide comments reinforcing their opinion saying that the speakers were "informed", "helpful" and "courteous".

*Question 4: Did you feel the open house session was worthwhile?*

A large majority of respondents at all meetings in all districts said "yes" (Table 18).

*Question 5: Do you feel the information exchange was worthwhile?*

A large majority of respondents at all meetings in all districts felt that the information exchange was worthwhile (Table 19). Many went on to make comments encouraging further meetings and more exchange of information.

*Question 6: Would you like further information sent to you regarding Alberta's forest resource?*

Slightly more respondents answered "no" to this question than answered "yes" (Table 20). Responses for all districts are fairly equally divided between positive and negative, with an equal number choosing

Table 17. Question 3: Did You Find the Speakers to be Informed and Open to Your Comments?

| Response | Number of Responses | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AT | GP | LL | PR | SL | WT | TOTAL |
| Yes | 7 | 99 | 12 | 120 | 64 | 5 | 307 |
| No | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 10 |
| Undecided | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| No Response | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 23 |

not to respond. Fifty respondents identified specific topic areas about which they wanted more information or specific publications which they wanted to receive.

The field staff of the Alberta Forest Service are responsible for responding to the requests for additional information. Though some offices have responded, the authors are unable to comment on the nature and completeness of the answers, as this information was not available.

Table 18. Question 4: Did You Feel The Open House Session was Worthwhile?

| Response | Number of Responses | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AT | GP | LL | PR | SL | WT | TOTAL |
| Yes | 10 | 103 | 16 | 124 | 60 | 6 | 319 |
| No | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 14 |
| Undecided | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| No Response | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 10 |

Table 19. Question 5: Do You Feel the Information Exchange was Worthwhile?

| Response | Number of Responses | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AT | GP | LL | PR | SL | WT | TOTAL |
| Yes | 10 | 92 | 14 | 118 | 59 | 5 | 298 |
| No | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
| Undecided | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 12 |
| No Response | 2 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 33 |

Table 20. Question 6: Would You Like Further Information Sent to You Regarding Alberta's Forest Resource?

| Response | Number of Responses | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AT | GP | LL | PR | SL | WT | TOTAL |
| Yes | 5 | 39 | 9 | 21 | 24 | 4 | 102 |
| No | 2 | 35 | 5 | 59 | 26 | 2 | 129 |
| Undecided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| No Response | 6 | 34 | 9 | 48 | 20 | 1 | 118 |

# CHAPTER 7

# CONCLUSIONS

The public information meetings held in forty-one communities across the north were designed to provide information to the people of the region on forest management, new developments, and to explain the negotiation process for Forest Management Agreements (FMA). A key objective was to explain the role and responsibility of the Alberta Forest Service, the Public Lands Division and the Fish and Wildlife Division in the process and subsequent implementation.

The series of open houses and public meetings provided an opportunity for more than 1900 people to participate in an informal process to obtain information, and to express concerns regarding forest management and development. Four issue areas emerge as key public concerns. These are:

- Forest Practices;
- Forest Management Agreement Process;
- Public Participation in Decision Making; and
- Emissions from Plants.

The public was very interested in forest practices and subjects related to this topic were raised most frequently. This is understandable as the meetings were designed to provide information on forest management. Reforestation was raised at meetings in all forest districts, and the commitment of the government to ensure replacement of forests was questioned. The concept of sustained yield, the management practices and procedures required to achieve the objective, was discussed at many meetings. Timber harvesting techniques, including cutblock design, clearcut vs selective cutting and 2- vs 3-pass system, were of primary concern in forest districts where new projects are proposed.

A large number of participants expressed dissatisfaction with the FMA process. In particular, topics were raised such as the government's approach to planning and the negotiation process. Specific concerns included the number and scale of FMA's, the concentration of timber supply, and the lack of public input to the negotiation process.

The public was concerned about government decision making. Participants stated explicit concerns with the style of decision making. These included topics such as lack of participation by the public, the need for an integrated review of both the pulp mill and the FMA, and the need for an open and credible review process.

The fourth major issue area identified at the open houses and public meetings was the concern for air and water emissions from plants. These concerns related to existing and proposed pulp mills.

The public concern for environmental protection, including concerns about better forest management practises and plant emissions, prevailed at all meetings. There were people at most meetings that supported forest development, but the majority of people who attended the sessions put the highest priority on environmental protection.

The media scanning revealed a significant concern regarding pulp mill development, the style and approach of government decision-making, the lack of a comprehensive environmental impact assessment process and inadequate public involvement. These issues appear consistently in both the local and provincial/national print media. There was not an urban/rural split on most of the issues. While the economic benefits of forestry developments were identified, the

more major concerns were about environmental protection.

The overwhelming public concern identified in the questionnaires was the need for adequate reforestation to ensure that forests are available for future generations. Concern about the impact of development on wildlife ranked second and well above all other issues.

The majority of 352 respondents who filled in the questionnaires, considered the open house and public meetings informative and worthwhile.

# APPENDIX A

## Summary Record Of Open Houses and Public Meetings

# APPENDIX A

## SUMMARY RECORD OF OPEN HOUSES AND PUBLIC MEETINGS

The issues, concerns and comments raised at each community open house and/or public meeting have been summarized in the following section. The information is presented by community; the communities are grouped according to forest districts. The Forest Superintendent in each district was responsible for organizing and conducting the meetings.

The issue or question raised is presented in point form. If a response to an issue (or answer to a question) was provided at the meeting, it appears in italics under the statement. As indicated in Chapter 2, most of the sessions were open houses, and it was not possible to listen in on all conversations. Therefore, questions or issued raised may have been answered, but not recorded.

# PEACE RIVER FOREST

### *KEG RIVER*
### *Open House*

**February 15, 1989**

**Issues Raised**

- Small contractors should be offered an opportunity to log - not everything to big companies.
- Concern regarding preserving softwood understory when you harvest the hardwood overstory.
- Concern about water quality from the proposed pulp mill.
- Limited concern about loss of trapping opportunities.
- Limited concern about soil exposure to erosion from scarification.

### *DIXONVILLE*
### *Open House*
### *And*
### *Public Meetings*

**February 16, 1989**

**Issues Raised**

- Concern about the number of development commitments made in a short time.
- Local contractors (small) in the area should be given a chance to log for industry - not everything to big contractors.
- Must ensure timber availability for generations to come. Reforestation must be successful.
- Timber must be available through public woodlots for non-industry use.
- Concern for effect of major developments on existing quota-

operators supply of timber and long term viability of industry.

- Concern regarding the number and scale of proposed developments made in a short time.
- Long-term availability of farmland in the Chinook Valley?

  *Emphasis on forestry will result in re-evaluation of land sales to agriculture.*
- Encourage the forest industry to co-operate with other users, i.e., tourism, agriculture.
- Concern with effluents from the pulp mill on air and water.
- Like three- pass logging for wildlife.
- Aesthetics must be considered in logging practices.
- Encourage control of post-harvest access to protect wildlife.

## *MANNING*
## *Open House*

**February 17, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Local contractors in the area should be given an opportunity to share in the benefits (economic).
- Do we know enough about reforestation to ensure forest renewal?

  *Reforestation on cutover areas in Alberta has a 95% success rate on areas at least 10 years old.*
- Concern for impact of widespread clearcutting on watershed, particularly erosion.
- Concern with flooding of agricultural lands due to clearcutting.
- Concern with inadequate staffing in Fish and Wildlife to enforce Wildlife Act, monitor forest operations and effective input into harvest development.

  *Staffing in enforcement will be increased.*
- Management and control of post-harvest access is necessary to protect wildlife.
- Native hunting should be controlled.
- The credibility of harvest planning in the Naylor Hills was questioned.
- Will more farm land be made available after logging?
- Availability of timber to local users through public woodlots?

  *Timber will remain available to local residents.*
- Request more information regarding management of aspen in the White Area.

  *Local opportunities for deciduous harvesting will be provided on public and private lands in the White Area.*
- Request of AFS to hold open houses annually. Complimentary to staff for information and patience in discussions and answers.
- Concern for water quality and air quality from pulp mill effluent.
- Will there be increased traffic on local roads from logging?

  *Concern has been passed on to Alberta Transportation.*
- Encouraged to hear that cutting is regulated, planting does occur and aspen is being used.

## *THREE CREEKS*
## *Open House*

**February 20, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Is sustained yield really sustainable?

  *Yes*

- Concerned over future possible expansion of mill.

- Are harvested areas going over to Agriculture?

  *Not in the green areas.*

- Increased access will lead to wildlife depletion.

- Not enough staff will be available to control access or logging operations.

- Concern was expressed regarding the size of cut backs.

- Stiffer fines required for trans-agressors of hunting or access regulations.

- Is there enough timber to supply all the mills?

  *Yes*

- Wildlife will be adversely impacted.

- Too many chemicals already in our environment.

- Is there any commitment to install new technology as it becomes available (re: anti-pollution at mill)?

  *Unsure. That is the juridiction of Alberta Environment.*

- Air and water pollution concerns.

- Ban white paper and substitute brown unbleached paper.

- No public input to decision making.

- How can I get some economic benefit from the projects?

- Small contractors must continue to have access to, and the opportunity for, both conifer and deciduous logging.

## *WEBERVILLE*
## *Open House*
## *and*
## *Public Meetings*

**February 21, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Where is the Lubicon reserve to be and when will it be established?

- Cutting mature forests first removes the best wildlife habitat.

- Wildlife access control. How can that be enforced?

- Don't like the format of an open house.

- Mill will have a significant impact on the rest of our lives.

- Our quality of life will be threatened.

- Flow of information is one-sided in an open house format. One open house or meeting in the Peace River area is insufficient.

- Public open hearings be undertaken in the Peace Region and Edmonton in the form of ERCB and to be conducted by the ECA.

- Funding for Environmental Interest Groups to obtain independent consultants.

- Moratorium on all pulp mills until public involvement in all matters of forestry and environment.

- Friends of the Peace think Forestry people have concerns themselves but won't bring them up due to job security.

- What type of public forum is planned for the annual operating plans and forest management plans? What is Diashowa's role in this? When and where will it occur?

- How many hectares of timber will be required for each of the five, possibly six pulping facilities.

- What will the size of each FMA be?

- What scale of increase does this represent in relation to Alberta's original pulping facilities in Grande Prairie and Hinton?

- Any additional expansions proposed? If so where, how much more land and timber would be involved?

- If the price of pulp declines will the Alberta Government provide financial assistance to operate the facilities?

- Revenue generated by the resource to the province represents less than 1% of the profit Daishowa would make. Does the government believe this is adequate payment for this resource?

- What are the costs to the province of increased staff to monitor and measure?

- What are the estimated health costs from pollution?

- How much revenue will be lost from the tourist industry as a result of environmental degradation? How will the future of tourism be affected?

- Will the environmental effluent standards be available to the public prior to upcoming election?

- What plans/actions are available in the case of a railway car spill of chlorine?

The following issues were raised by the Fish and Game Association.

- The financial profit from the project will be good for the area.

- Everyone agrees the 3-cut system is best for wildlife, why not 3-cut all the time?

  *The 2-cut system is the best solution to all the users of the forest, not only the timber companies. In special areas i.e., endangered wildlife habitat AFS would consider the 3-cut system. The 3-cut system would result in an additional 60 years of access.*

- Fish and Game Assoc. want an input into the harvest planning.

- Continued access will make management difficult, and over-hunting is likely to occur.

- Is Forestry prepared to allow some kind of direct input from interested groups in the actual ground rules that are being put forward?

- How much money is being spent by forestry on timber inventory, versus Fish and Wildlife for wildlife inventory, over the past 10 years? The perception is that forestry has greatly outweighted wildlife for inventory.

  *$15 million for phase three timber inventory, $300,000 for wildlife over the last ten years. Fish and Wildlife received considerable benefit from the phase three inventory and other programs (soil surveys).*

The Trappers Association raised the following issues.

- Will forestry hold a public hearing in Peace River and allow enough time for everyone to ask all their questions? There is not enough time tonight to have all the questions answered.

*Open house is first step. Give AFS your concerns with a thought towards how we are managing the forests, that is the first step. The liaison with the public is a two way system and it will be long-term. AFS and the companies will be coming back to the public when Forestry Management plans are developed and they have something to present with more "meat". We expect that you will have another opportunity with the companies and the AFS at a later date.*

- Answers to questions are just generating more questions.

  *There have been previous meetings with Fish and Game and the Friends of the Peace. AFS is not afraid or hiding anything. We would be glad to meet with your organization as well. Give us your questions, let us get on with it and get a response back to you. Don't wait and hold your questions.*

- Why are information sessions taking on a different format in different parts of the province?

  *The choice is made by the area Superintendent.*

- Explain what areas are critical wildlife wintering areas and what steps are taken by AFS to protect those areas.

  *A definition of critical area was discussed. Most are in river valleys and, as such, will not be logged. They use selective burns to manage and augment the habitat, they can manage access, cutting phases and the time period between cuts.*

Non-Aligned Individuals

- Does wildlife interest have enough say in these forestry developments?

  *Each individual (F & W, AFS, Companies, etc.) would probably like more of a say, but it must be understood that we are managing the forest for a host of different users.*

- We are moving too fast in an area (i.e., poplar regeneration) where we have very little information.

- Need more opportunities to ask questions. All the issues have not come out yet.

- Wilderness Areas should be set aside.

  *Areas currently set aside will not be logged. There are programs such as Natural Areas and Ecological Areas to serve the function of setting aside areas.*

- Increased access will create over-hunting by natives.

## *HINES CREEK*
## *Open House*

**February 22, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Concern about the size of FMA's and level of annual forest depletion.

- Is reforestation adequate now? Seem to be a lot of areas with no trees!

  *More trees are being planted than are harvested. 80% or more reforestation success in pine; some problems with spruce, but these are being addressed in the free-to-grow program. There is a backlog but it is also being addressed. The FMA's are being reforested as a contractural requirement.*

- Will CanFor still operate in Hines Creek?

  *AFS made a clear statement that the wood is there if the company wants to make the necessary commitment.*

- What will be the effects on wildlife of these developments?
- Concern for wildlife reaches beyond trapping and hunting, to survival of the species.
- Why does access into cutblocks remain open to ATV's when it is cutoff to vehicles - close it to all traffic.
- Don't accept the bleached kraft process-dioxin should not be permitted at any level.
- Taxpayers dollars are at risk on these projects.
- Question the reliability of the timber cruise information of the government; if questionable what happens to the FMA's.
- Request open forum (public participation) with F & W/AFS/ Companies to address the whole project. Public wants to be part of the process and to be heard.
- Complimentary to presentors for information and patience in meeting public.
- Greater confidence in project since talking to participants and hearing that harvest is regulated and reforestation is occurring.
- Encouraged to know that aspen will be used.

## *WORSELY*
## *Open House*

**February 23, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Alberta Environment should have been here.
- Too much timber is being given to too few companies.
- Too many mega-projects announced at the same time!
- Can you (government) sustain the timber supply to these developments? Is there enough timber and are we going to grow enough?

  *Existing timber (mainly deciduous) is under-utilized. Developments will use deciduous. Deciduous is more easily regenerated than coniferous. Coniferous is available in more limited supplies, but we operate on regulated cut and replace more than what is cut.*
- Suspicious of foreign investment and perceived ownership of forests.

  *Regardless of ownership, the companies are subject to contractural requirements enforced by Canadian law.*
- CanFor received considerable attention by contractors and employees re - viability of Hines Creek mill.
- Are you harvesting the Clear Hills? What are the impacts?

  *Yes, but the logging is restricted and other values are being given equal importance.*
- Concern about the impact of these developments on wildlife (harvest of habitat and improved access to hunters).
- Are Forestry and Fish and Wildlife able to monitor what the companies do? Is staff adequate to do the job?

  *No commitment for more Forestry staff, but more F & W enforcement officers will be hired.*
- Concern about pollution of waters from logging and mills.

- The buffer widths around the lakes should be much wider; up to 1 mile.
- Favorable response to 3-pass logging for moose habitat.
- Essential to have successful reforestation.
- Concern for potential erosion from timber harvest.
- Request for more open houses.
- Complimentary to presentors for information, and patience in presentations.

# GRANDE PRAIRIE FOREST

## *EAGLESHAM*
## *Open House*

**February 28, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Does the Department have enough staff to effectively deal with all the new development?

  *No planned increase in AFS staff, however, expect more management by industry staff.*

- Support for harvesting and managing the forest. Recognize that forest management and farming are similar, however, dealing with different crops.
- Concerned about reforestation and growth of cutblocks.

  *Alberta's reforestation policy is one of the best in Canada. Have a 95% success rate on areas ten years and older.*

- Concerned about supply of conifers for all the new mills.

  *Were pleased to learn that the majority of the wood for the new developments would be hardwood.*

- Concerned about bull moose population and felt hunting season should be closed during the rut.
- The logging and the oil and gas industries were creating too much access.

  *AFS, Fish & Wildlife and industry are working on solutions.*

- Concerned about water quality of rivers. Cattle won't drink water in Smoky River.

  *This concern should be brought to the attention of Alberta Environment.*

## *SPIRIT RIVER*
## *Open House*

**March 01, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Concern for magnitude and number of FMA's announced simultaneously.
- Concern about Proctor and Gamble pulp mill effluent into Wapiti River.
- Concern for survival of wildlife from improved access to public associated with timber harvest.
- Opposed to logging within the Peace River valley.
- Concern for survival of woodland caribou with increased timber harvest. What management plans are in place?

*Deferred logging schedules, leave blocks and withdrawals from FMA for habitat and travel corridors. Research in progress to determine numbers and dynamics.*

- Approve of the 3-pass logging system for conservation of habitat.

- Does 20 year agreement for FMA mean that all the timber is liquidated in 20 years?

  *No, the agreement is renegotiated after 20 years.*

- We must have successful reforestation and implement the "free to grow" program if we are to have forests.

## *BONANZA*
## *Open House*

**March 2, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Why is Alberta reluctant to issue export permits for aspen? The Bonanza area has a lot of old aspen which P & G or Diashawa will not be interested in due to distance to market.

  *BC Government and Louisiana Pacific set limits on the amount of aspen imported from Alberta. AFS agrees with the sale of residual aspen on coniferous cut blocks, and will recommend export permits be issued for this product.*

- Good quality lumber is exported to the USA. Forest industry should make top quality lumber available locally at reasonable price.

- The forest industry should strive to create more local employment rather than reduce employment through mechanization.

- Why are lumber dues so low in Alberta?

  *Alberta demands that industry carry out a very high standard of reforestation, environmental protection and provide stable employment. The money not spent in dues is expected to be directed to these three areas.*

- The Government has contributed financial assistance to big corporations (many largely foreign controlled) in the form of roads and bridges, while at the same time local road construction is not being funded.

- Are we reforesting our cutovers? We don't see many small trees coming back.

  *Yes. We are reforesting all cutovers and the majority is successful. The regulations were explained in detail.*

- Concern was expressed about logging too close to the Peace River.

- There is too much timber being tied up by large industry, more should be left for local use.

- Many people upset with the recent announcement regarding new pulp mills. There are a lot of negative rumours, and it will take many open houses to regain credibility.

- With the major increase in forest development how can the AFS staff ensure adequate environmental protection? AFS must hire more Rangers.

- Aspen should be sold by tender, it would return the same price as private landowners get and will compete more fairly with private landowners.

- News clips on TV should explain what will happen to the forests in 25 years.

- Native hunting must be controlled.

- Scarcity of bull moose and poor calf crop indicates a need to close hunting during the rut and shorten the hunting season.
- ATV's should be out-lawed.
- Too much access results in indiscriminate use of ATV's and snowmobiles, the game is harassed and over-hunted. More control on ATV's and access is required.
- Smaller wildlife species are being ignored in the government's management practices.
- Retain some old growth forest for species that rely on this habitat.
- Like the 3-pass cutting system as it leaves more cover.
- Logging creates a lot more feed for wildlife - it is not all bad.
- Dioxin in the rivers is a major concern.

## *BEAVERLODGE*
## *Open House*

**April 06, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Concern that clearing of forest (aspen) will produce marginal agricultural land. Farmers will clear for profit leaving poor agricultural opportunities.
- Recommend turning marginal farm land back to Green Area.
- Concern that projects are concentrating wood supply among a few large, foreign-owned companies.
- Concern that small operators will not be protected.
- Cutblocks are too large!
- Concern about the impact of logging on wildlife, particularly new access.
- Retain old growth forest for wildlife habitat.
- Agree with 3-pass logging for habitat protection of ungulates.
- The moose season is too long.
- Concern about the impacts of effluent from the mill (Proctor and Gamble).
- Concern about the impacts of clear-cutting on watershed and climate.
- Like the Natural Area concept.
- I don't agree with uncontrolled native hunting.
- Can I log my grazing lease?

  *No.*

- Is reforestation occurring and is it adequate? Can you guarantee adequate renewal of the land base to trees?

  *Yes, policies and resources in place are sufficient to ensure a perpetual crop.*

- What wood is the new mill going to use?

  *Aspen.*

- What are the differences between the kraft and CTMP processes?
- Can I export aspen roundwood to B.C.?

  *Yes.*

- Is nursery stock adequate (quality and quantity)?

  *The quality of container stock is good, but we are having problems with bare-root stock.*

- When will the West Peace Regional Plan be released?

  *Summer/Fall 1989.*

- Is "free to grow" accepted and is it policy?

  *Yes.*

- Is CanFor using herbicide?

  *Roadside brush control only.*

## *GROVEDALE*
## *Open House*

**April 07, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Concern about concentrating wood supply among a few large, foreign-owned companies affecting the supply to small, local industry.
- Impact of logging on wildlife, particularly new access.
- Concern about the impact of mill effluent on the Wapiti River.
- Concern about uncontrolled native hunting.
- Like 3-pass logging for conservation of ungulate habitat.
- The moose season is too long.
- Retain wildlands for wilderness experience - a pristine environment is the only wilderness I will accept.
- Is reforestation occurring, and is it adequate. Can you guarantee adequate renewal of the land base to trees?

  *Industry says there is no problem in pine, but admits a problem with competition in spruce.*

## *DEBOLT*
## *Open House*

**April 11, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Concerned about adequate levels of, and the methods used, for reforestation.
- Concern about procedures and regulations being in place to ensure regeneration of spruce.
- Concerned about erosion and siltation due to forestry operations.
- Concerned about sustainable yield and how quickly do tree species regenerate?
- Will flooding be the result of clear-cutting and forest removal?
- What are the volumes of timber being removed?
- What are the methods used to calculate the volumes of available timber and the adequacy of future timber supplies.
- Is there a loss of transpiration due to the loss of timber?
- Concerned about increased potential for fire due to increased access into areas.
- Concerns about blowdowns with partial clear-cuts.
- What are the benefits of, and concerns about, clear-cutting?
- Are there positive aspects of using exotic tree species, such as blue spruce, in reforestation?
- Once an area is logged is there a chance it may not be returned to forestry?
- Is there enough timber to meet the needs of the mills?

- Who designs the forestry plans?
- Does the Forest Service restock burned-over areas?
- Concerned about increased access and the negative effects on wildlife as a result of hunting and harassment. Wanted access managed to minimize these impacts.
- Concerns about the protection of wildlife, especially to moose and deer?
- Concerns about the loss of wildlife habitat, especially old growth habitat, and the effects on the species.
- What is the damage to forests by forestry equipment compared to the lack of damage by using the horse?
- Concerns about the use of herbicides on cutblocks.
- What are the impacts of pulp mill effluents and other pollutants on fish and water resources (streams and rivers)?
- Are the effects of logging on wildlife monitored, and are fish and wildlife plans being implemented?
- Is industry implementing "tools" to assist wildlife?
- Concerned about the inadequate number of fish and wildlife officers for the region to help regulate timber management.
- Are the concerns of trappers taken into account in the forestry planning process?
- Are fish in the river safe to eat?
- Are industry operating plans re-viewed by Alberta Fish and Wildlife?

  *Yes*

- How much input does Alberta Fish and Wildlife have in forestry planning?
- How much money does the government contribute to forestry developments?
- What about the die-off of fish in Sturgeon Lake and the presence of algae blooms?
- What are the effects of native hunting on wildlife populations?
- What are the benefits of the pulp mills to government other than increased employment?
- Concerns on the effects of salt from the roads on watercourses and fish.
- Concerns on the preservation of grazing lands.

## *VALLEYVIEW*
## *Open House*

**April 12, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Concern about protecting wood supplies for permit holders and quotas re: concentrating wood supply among a few large, foreign-owned companies.
- Impact of logging on wildlife, particularily the effects of new access.
- Control new access by employing a combination of legislation and physical barriers.
- Concern about the effects of mill effluent on the Wapiti and Peace rivers.
- The province is giving away the resource. Why all now?
- Doesn't agree with uncontrolled native hunting.

- Likes the 3-pass logging system for conservation of ungulate habitat.
- The season for moose is too long.
- Want a mile-wide buffer on all permanent water courses.
- Don't like clearcutting! Want selective logging.
- User of wildlife should pay more for privilege and returns should be invested in inventory.
- Curtail sales of public lands because all owners want is the timber to sell.
- Is reforestation occurring and is it adequate?

  *Yes, legislation and resources are sufficient - learning more all the time. New developments involve aspen and we can regenerate aspen.*
- Is there sufficient staff to do the job in enforcing regulations on companies?
- Can I log the aspen on my grazing lease and sell the timber?

  *No*
- Have you considered deletions from the FMA's for other users?

  *Deletions have been made for other users.*

## *GRANDE PRAIRIE*
## *Open House*
## *And*
## *Public Meeting*

**April 21, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Concerned about concentrating the timber supply among a few large, foreign-owned companies.
- The province is giving away the resources. Why all now?
- Is reforestation occurring, and is it adequate? Can you guarantee adequate renewal of the land base to trees?

  *Yes/No. Legislation and enforcement plus resources and expertise are adequate to ensure a new forest. Pine reforestation is good, spruce needs help and aspen poses the fewest concerns in the short-term.*
- Impact of logging on wildlife, particularly new access.
- Concerned about mill effluent on the Wapiti River. When are you (Proctor and Gamble) going to stop it?
- Marginal land to grazing. Why not to grain?

  *Land won't support grain production.*
- Doesn't agree with uncontrolled native hunting.
- Like 3-pass logging for the conservation of ungulate habitat.
- Staffing is too low to permit the Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife to do their jobs.
- Doesn't like clearcutting! Want selective logging.
- Stop the sale of public lands because all the owner wants is the timber to sell - gain revenue through non-agricultural use.
- Quantify the effects of air emissions from the mill and loss of forest cover on the greenhouse effect? Request a moratorium on development until these questions are answered.

- Odour from the mill is going to ruin the tourist industry which generates more revenue than forestry.

- What is the effect of carbon dioxide on temperature?

- Why are there no politicians on the panel? There are major differences between policy and what happens, or doesn't happen. Who is making the decisions in government?

- Does information ever get to the politicians from the bureaucrats? Why are the politicians not here?

- We can't afford to recycle paper in this region, yet you tell us we can afford to build another mill-doesn't make sense.

- Can we sustain current harvest with new development? I know the government people are doing the best they can. I can't say the same for the politicians.

- Wants a mill with "0" effluent and no chlorine.

  *Chlorine bleach is needed to produce white paper with strength. If the consumer will accept other products - we will change. We are working on effluent reduction with innovative technology.*

- What are the returns to the province from standing wood? How come the stumpage rate is one of the lowest in the country? The 15% surtax on lumber has gone to stumpage elsewhere, why not here.
  *The stumpage rates are low because industry shoulders costs of reforestation and road construction.*

- Supportive position to Proctor and Gambles silvicultural efforts.

- Industry manages for timber, F & W is inadequately funded to do inventory. Who manages for other things? How can you manage a forest on a bureaucratic division of responsibility? Government does not reflect appropriate priorities.

- Request for public hearings into forestry development. Request for conservation strategy directed to sustained development.

- Is Proctor and Gamble going to take all the chips from the north.

  *Yes, subject to quality and chip allocation.*

- Questioned some contradictory information in government publications about the impact of logging on surface hydrology (run-off regime and timing) and flooding.

- Recycle of paper is regionally available. Why aren't unbleached products available? Proctor and Gamble should take the lead and show the way. Bleached products should be outlawed in Europe.

  *Public has not expressed a demand in the market place - when they do we will respond. Remember most domestic pulp is refined overseas to meet their demand.*

- Comments on observations of change in the bush as a result of clear-cut harvest. "Renewal is taking place (go see for yourself) and wildlife is there".

- Government has sold the store (land) along with the goods (timber). Forest Service custodians are not doing their jobs on behalf of the public. This meeting is only for public relations - what's done is done! Public have no say in what happens!

  *Public will have opportunity to participate in long-term planning at some level.*

- What are the staff, areas of management and budgets for the Forest

Service, Fish and Wildlife and Proctor and Gamble.

*Fish and Wildlife*

*Area* *38 % of Alberta*
*Staff* *45*
*Budget* *$2MM*

*Alberta Forest Service*

*Area* *14000 square miles*
*Staff* *31*
*Budget* *$2MM*

*Proctor and Gamble*

*Area* *5000 square miles*
*Staff* *21*
*Budget* *$3MM*

- Why don't you answer our questions? Can't you lead, rather than be led?
- Comparisons between the kraft and CTMP processes.

  *Twice as much wood required to produce same amount of pulp from kraft as CTMP.*
- Why does the government accept obsolete pulp mill technology? Proctor and Gamble - change to meet your responsibilities.

# WHITECOURT FOREST

## *SWAN HILLS Open House*

**February 22, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Why is Alberta Environment not in attendance? Alberta Environment should be here!
- Is there enough timber to support these projects?

  *There is a current surplus in deciduous and coniferous which is available. This surplus is in addition to current allocations.*
- Is reforestation successful (planting enough and are the trees growing)?
- What are the impacts of the project(s) on wildlife?
- Access created by harvest will have to be controlled if wildlife is to be preserved (conserved?).
- What happens to other users when the FMA is granted?

  *Other users are permitted.*
- Which are the least damaging processes for pulping? Why are other companies proposing harmful processes?

  *Not all companies make the same products - some products require bleaching which involves a different process.*
- Public appreciative of opportunity to ask questions and be informed.

## *FORT ASSINIBOINE Open House*

**April 12, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- What is the status of the tree nursery proposed for Fort Assiniboine?

  *The location for a nursery has not been finalized.*
- Interest in the proposed road extension (SR 661) linking Fort Assiniboine with Slave Lake.

- Concern for commitments to reforestation.
- Concern about increase in wind with openings created by cutblocks.
- Sceptical of the Government's capability to deal with the following:
  -erosion control on cutblocks
  -logging and stream buffers
  -CTMP mills vs. bleached kraft
  -herbicides/revegetation
  -reforestation
- Concern about the large number of forestry developments all at one time, and felt that past management has allowed companies to "cut and run", leaving a mess to be cleaned up.
- Concern about government commitment to long-term forest renewal.
- Don't like foreign investment i.e., foreign ownership of forests.
- What is there to prevent the companies from creaming the best and then leaving (leaving us to cleanup the mess) after the investment incentives have runout?

  *The process for negotiation of an FMA includes contractual commitments to invest and perform to specific standards on the part of the company. The company must also post a large performance bond which will be forfeited if the company defaults on their commitments.*
- Concern expressed over the physical size of the FMA's, and the area to be cut annually.
- Local contractors want opportunities to participate in the projects.
- Public appreciated the opportunity to meet the government and industry.
- A request was made that natives be given an FMA in Forest Management Unit S11 in which to manage for sustained development of a native lifestyle including timber, trapping and tourism.

  *Timber will be made available to natives by permit - not an FMA*
- Concern expressed about viability of guiding and wildlife in the face of development.

  *Government will review the FMA, ground rules and plans with a view to impact on other users.*
- Town council favourable to development, but not at any cost (quality of local life, water and air quality).

# SLAVE LAKE FOREST

***SLAVE LAKE***
***Open House***
***and***
***Public Meetings***

**February 20, 1989**

## Issues Raised

- Concern about the impact of forest harvest on wildlife habitat (loss) and access (harassment and hunting pressure).
- Concern about effects of effluent from the mill(s) (Alberta Energy Company and Alberta Pacific) on the Athabasca River.
- Why is Alberta Environment not at the open house?

  *The open house addresses forest management and the FMA - not the mills.*

## *KINUSO*
## *Open House*

**February 21, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Surprise and concern at the size of the Daishowa and Alberta Pacific FMA's.
- Will there be timber for small operators?

  *Quotas, C.T.P's and L.T.P's will continue to be made available.*
- How do you log in a 2-pass system and save coniferous regeneration?
- Credibility of government and company commitments to long-term management?
- Concern about the impact of new projects on wildlife relative to loss of habitat and increased pressure from hunting?
- General concern about effluent from mill(s) on Athabasca and Peace Rivers?
- Favourable comments on format, quality of information and willingness of presentors to talk.
- Favourable comment on proposed Alberta Energy Company mill and FMA - clean (no chlorine) and the small area they will draw their timber from.

## *HIGH PRAIRIE*
## *Open House*

**February 23, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Is regeneration capable of giving us sustained yield?
- You are taking away the trees and not replacing them.
- Concern about fish, ungulate, fur-bearer management and protection.
- Concern about public access to forest management areas.
- Forest developments affect multiple use.
- FMA's need EIA's.
- Concern about water quality due to effluents from the mill.
- Change people's habits; then demand for paper can't justify pulp mills.
- Japanese record on the environment given rise to distrust of their ownership.
- Fish and Wildlife incapable (man-power, budget) of handling forest development referrals.
- Is the loss of forests worth the jobs created?
- Mill should have been located further west: High Prairie haulers can't compete because of trucking costs.

## *RED EARTH*
## *Open House*

**February 27, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- What will the impact of development be on the environment?
- What is involved with reforestation? What is silviculture?

  *These were explained by AFS staff.*

- Development should provide more access and roads to permit increase in recreation for local residents.
- Concerned about access control to protect wildlife.
- Positive comments on the work of the Alberta Forest Service.

## *PEERLESS LAKE*
## *Open House*

**February 28, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Concerns about the impact of forest operations on trapping. Potential loss of traplines is a real concern in the community.

  *Alberta-Pacific is working on a trapper compensation policy.*
- Traditional native trapping areas should be dealt with differently than Metis or Treaty traplines.
- Community wants direct compensation for impacts.
- Local people should be hired for slashing lines and other forest jobs.
- AFS should ensure that ground rules state "personal contact" shall be made 10 days prior to start of operations, as well as review 5 year plans with trappers.

## *WHITEFISH/GIFT LAKE*
## *Open House*

**March 4, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Wanted to know if the problems of pollution and acid rain had been taken into consideration in planning these developments.
- Concerns about job opportunities and native employment.
- General questions on fire and reforestation were discussed.

## *SMITH*
## *Open House*

**April 06, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Question the concept of sustained yield.
- Creating a monoculture forest.
- Require more baseline studies on water.
- More public input particularly at the deficiency stages.
- Forestry is giving its seal of approval by appearing at the open houses with the companies.
- Thermo-mechanical is preferred rather than Kraft process.
- Fish and Wildlife concerns should be honoured. Long narrow cutblocks and not large tracts.
- Access should be terminated after harvest either through legislation or otherwise, but access termination should be effective.
- Alberta Pacific must cut in all areas of the FMA so they don't take all the cheap timber then walk away when pulp prices fall.
- Increase of AFS and F & W staff required for monitoring.
- Sedimentation of streams in cut blocks.

- People feel alienated by the government process to date.
- Implement the ECA 1979 recommendations for forestry development in Alberta.
- Public hearings on any Forest Management Agreement.
- Government has dictated the process. Has resulted in confrontation rather than consultation.
- Forestry panel is a positive step but has been taken too late.
- Can the huge demands required of the Alberta Pacific mill be met under such severe time constraints?
- Mixed forest must be maintained.
- Concerned about the use of pesticides.
- How are the aspects of other resources and other users of the forests going to be considered. For example source of clean water, fish, wildlife, recreational uses.
- How can you have effective management of the forest when everything has to be done as quickly as possible to ensure a profit for the operator?
- Violations are not enforceable with current staff levels.
- Monocultural forest created by the harvesting are subject to infestations and destruction.
- Will there be sufficient old forest left for wildlife habitat.
- Input from F & W should, at a minimum, be at the same level as AFS input.
- Why are Forest Management Agreements not included in the Environmental Impact Assessment.
- Must consider the protection of the native lifestyle.
- Concerned over the use of heavy equipment for harvesting and resultant soil compaction.
- Performance of regeneration is the key rather than penalties for non-performance.

### *FAWCETT*
### *Open House*

**April 07, 1989**

**Issues Raised**

- Desire development in High Level area so some infastructure can be developed there i.e., rail, road, etc.
- Timber is the resource that we should be using.
- Concern over water and air pollution.
- Forest development is long over due. Let's get on with it.

### *WABASCA*
### *Open House*

**April 28, 1989**

**Issues Raised**

- All the wood will be taken out of our area with little, if any, local economic benefit.
- Concern over mill pollution.
- Its all said and done, too late to complain.
- Impact of the project on land claims.
- Impact on wildlife.

- Concern over reforestation and the time for regeneration.

### *CHIPEWYAN LAKES*
### *Open House*

**May 4, 1989**

**Issues Raised**

- Impact on wildlife and trappers.
- Economic benefits.
- Impact on traditional lifestyles with all the development in the area.

## LAC LA BICHE FOREST

### *GRASSLAND*
### *Open House*
### *And*
### *Public Meeting*

**February 28, 1989**

**Issues Raised**

- Request for public hearing on the Alberta Pacific project both the mill and the FMA.
- Request that EIA process be linked to the FMA
- Is the record of negotiations for the FMA available to the public?

  *No, negotiations are currently underway and are confidential. The ground rules and text of the agreement will be available.*

- Do sawlog operators have a legitimate fear for their livelihood? A request for a written guarantee that the operators will have timber.

  *The quota spheres of interest are exclusive of the annual allowable cut for the FMA. Trading of deciduous for coniferous wood between Alberta Pacific and quota holders is also an option. CTP's and LTP's will remain available.*

- Have there been suspensions of work and/or financial penalties imposed on licences in forestry? To whom and how much?

  *There have been operational and financial penalties to operators. Blocks can only be approved for harvest once existing blocks have been released. Names and penalties are public record. Penalties are in the order of several hundreds of dollars.*

- How big is the FMA and how large an area will be cut annually?

  *Approximately 72,500 km² of which 8-10 thousand hectares will be cut annually.*

- Is there a staffing increase to handle this development?

  *No, we have no indication that staffing will be increased.*

- What is the follow-up monitoring after planting?

  *Plantations are checked for survival the growing season after planting. Free-to-grow is intended to release coniferous trees from competition.*

- If you have a mixed forest now, will you have a mixed forest in the future?

  *It is probable that you will have a mixed forest afterwards even if it is planted and managed for either deciduous or coniferous trees.*

- What is the quality of the new forest after suckering?

*The quality of the forest is the same because the parents are the same. The forest maybe improved in quality of wood and growth if thinning, fertilization or genetic improvement occurs.*

- What do you know about regenerating aspen?

  *Aspen suckers after disturbance. Harvest promotes suckering and the growth of a new forest. Promote growth by thinning, fertilizing, etc. Company has committed to research into aspen silviculture.*

- Is there an increase in the budget for reforestation?

  *No, existing resources can meet the needs for reforestation.*

- What will be the impact of mill effluent on fish?

  *Project will not be approved unless standards for water quality are met. Monitoring by Alberta Environment occurs when the mill is operational.*

- Where is Alberta Environment?

- Is the case of pollution in the Wapiti River going to be repeated in the Athabasca?

  *Water quality standards will be met by Alberta Pacific. The standards reflect the health requirements of the users.*

- Concern that clearcutting will change the weather and, as a result, it will affect agriculture.

- How much is the research budget of Fish and Wildlife?

- When will the Athabasca River basin study be completed?

  *Alberta Environment is doing the study - it is currently underway.Fish and Wildlife are participants.*

- Can grazing lease holders harvest the trees and sell them?

  *No.*

- How is the royalty on mill production determined - weight, volume or end product?

  *The company pays stumpage on roundwood delivered to the mill. There is no royalty payment on intermediate or end product. The Province receives revenue through taxation.*

- Concern about $SO_2$ on trees.

- Does the company have a program to prevent private landowners with timber from liquidating the timber and causing wind and water erosion?

  *The company will have a woodlot program directed to sustained supply of timber.*

- Are you going to use herbicides?

  *No, herbicides are not licensed for use in forestry in Alberta.*

- What is the evidence supporting the conclusion that clearcutting has no impact on runoff?

- Request a transportation study because of all the new roads proposed for the northeast.

## *LAC LA BICHE*
## *Open House*
## *And*
## *Public Meetings*

**March 09, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Finding these meetings and EIA meetings grinding down those who

care to take the time to learn enough to ask questions.

- Interest groups request funding to undertake independent studies into the FMA process and the Alberta Pacific project. We believe the government has a second agenda they are not talking about - government is not being honest - we do not trust you!

  *No funding has been approved for such purposes.*

- How would we manage the resource if it were not considered renewable?

  *The forest is being managed on sustained production because it is renewable.*

- In Alberta who is the expert on aspen?

  *Ted Szabo with Forestry Canada - quite a bit of literature is available on aspen.*

- Big FMA, big cuts! Need guaranteed forest renewable.

- When does F & W come into the negotiations for the FMA?

  *Some involvement at initial negotiations more at ground rules and more yet in annual and 5 year plans.*

- Is 100% of the FMA negotiated at outset or is it assigned over time.

  *100% of the FMA is negotiated at the outset.*

- Markets for pulp fluctuate widely and frequently, are we going to invest heavily into a declining market?

- Why not public involvement in disposal of public resource? Why prepared answers?

  *They were leaked, but they (answers) were not secret. The answers were prepared so that 1) we had answers and 2) the answers where consistent across the province.*

- Want real public involvement in FMA negotiations.

  *Ministerial commitment to expert panel. AFS committed to invite the public to review the forest management plan.*

- 1984 provincial policy on Fish and Wildlife is too obscure - should be reinforced and tightened up to reflect real issues.

  *Described 1984 Policy.*

- Fish and Wildlife needs much more inventory and monitoring of species and populations if wildlife is to be managed? Bag statistics are not enough.

- Access control policy needed.

  *The concern about improved access is being addressed in negotiations and will be ongoing. We have been promised more enforcement manpower. Fish and Wildlife can't effect change in native hunting.*

- What controls are there of chemical use on private lands?

  *Public lands doesn't routinely use chemicals. We have no jurisdiction on private lands. You are best to talk to Agriculture. The AFS doesn't use chemicals.*

- No evidence of detailed (site specific) planning in FMA negotiations. For example:
  - wildlife inventories are inadequate.
  - budget and manpower are not adequate to monitor resource use.

  *No increase in staff or budget planned for AFS; F & W will receive more enforcement officers.*

- Have you (Government, Alberta Pacific) identified any unique (natural) areas within the FMA?

  *Special areas are under notation and have been withdrawn from the FMA.*

- Have you inventoried rare and endangered species?

  *None have been identified.*

- Want inventory studies into minor vegetation species.

- This (open houses/public meetings) has been a reactive process - too little and too late.

- Are ground rules applied over the entire FMA?

  *Yes.*

- Heard that under intensive management I could expect a 50% increase in timber (fiber) yield - is this true?

  *Yes/no, we can expect a significant increase if we thin and fertilize. The increase varies widely with location, site and treatment.*

- Heard that you receive high mortality of planted seedlings. True? What do you plan?

  *True, we (AFS) incur mortality in spruce because of competition from grass and shrubs. We started the free to grow program to solve this problem. We need support to keep the program going.*

- Trapping quota limits are arbitrary - no native input.

  *We need quotas if the resource is declining - everyone is subject to quotas.*

- Concern about the security of timber supply for permit holders (CTP and LTP's).

  *Yes, permit holders are protected because the timber is not part of the allowable cut for the FMA.*

- Should be a 10% margin in land allocation for withdrawals from the FMA for other uses as they occur.

  *There is a margin built into the disposition - 10% is too high.*

- Is there public input into the AOP (annual operating plan) process.

  *You have heard that the government has made a full commitment to public involvement.*

- Will the Lakeland Management Plan be affected by the FMA?

  *No, since the plan is outside the FMA. Peripheral impacts can be addressed.*

- The Lakeland plan was to be reviewed in 1988. It was not done, was it because of the FMA?

- Do the Japanese clearcut their forests? Is clearcutting the only method that can be used?

  *Don't know whether the Japanse clearcut. For aspen, clearcutting stimulates regeneration of a uniform crop. We won't produce monocultures because there is diversity which we do not manage. Ingress will occur overtime. We save understory by harvest practise and trading off the landbase between coniferous and deciduous.*

  *Eastern portion is undergoing review and once done the plan will be completely reviewed.*

- Want the Beaver River declared a Heritage River.

  *Will investigate the possibility.*

- What is the value of the bond that Alberta Pacific must post against default on the FMA.

*The sum is large - amount is under current negotiations.*

## *CONKLIN/JANVIER Open House*

**April 10, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Concern registered over all the chemicals used in the mill process.
- Athabasca Native Development Corporation (ANDC) should be contacted.
- Open house is not adequate.
- Head-to-head discussions with Alberta Pacific are required.
- Completed questionnaires should not be used at future dates as support for the projects.
- Concerned about forestry effects on trapping.
- Length of potential jobs. Long-term is the requirement, not short-term.
- Our forests are over-committed.
- Questions regarding the inventory of timber have not been answered.
- Companies will take far more timber than what is stated, and wildlife will suffer.
- Require economic compensation if traplines suffer so equipment can be purchased (for instance trucks) so the people can work or contract to the pulp company.
- There are other projects going on (i.e., oil and gas) and other concerns. Things are not as simple as just dealing with the forest projects by themselves.
- Meeting required in Conklin with Alberta Pacific, Alberta Environment, AFS and ANDC.
- Mill pollution.
- Environmental impact of woodlands operation.
- Timetables should be at the discretion of the communities not the companies.
- Communities need access to appropriate resources i.e., information experts, funding and, human resources.

## *BOYLE Open House and Public Meetings*

**April 24, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Will existing quota holders be protected?
- Will the availability of agricultural land in the northeast be affected by expansion of forestry?
- Opposed to uncontrolled native hunting - this will become more serious with improved access on new roads.
- Staffing should be increased in Fish and Wildlife to meet the increased demands for inspection of Company operations and inventory.
- How can you manage wildlife when you don't know what there is?
- Alberta Forest Service manages trees not forests! Forests are much more than fiber. Need integrated plan based on complete and current inventory of all forest components before proceeding. Forest Service and Fish

and Wildlife don't have the inventory and they don't have the people to get the inventory.

- Government should increase staffing in key areas.
- Alberta Pacific should employ a biologist.
- What are the impacts of the pulp mill on adjacent lands?
- Open house provided information only; We were told what decisions have already been made when I really want to know what the options are, and have a say in the decisions.
- What employment and service opportunities are there for the region?
- Recommendations #38 and #67 in the 1979 E.C.A. report have not been implemented. They recommended a public hearing process for forestry development. Will it be implemented?
- What trees are going to be used?
- Noticed loss in fish habitat over time in area because of agriculture and roads.Does the Fish and Wildlife Division do only reclamation in areas like these.
- What are the stages in the FMA planning, negotiating and approval process? Is (will) the agreement for the FMA be available to the public?

## *ATHABASCA*
## *Open House*
## *and*
## *Public Meetings*

**April 25, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Can a recreational developer establish a lodge in the FMA?

  *Yes. However, you will want to work with the company.*

- Impact of FMA on wildlife with improved road access and native hunting.

  *Wildlife will be affected. There is need to address new access. There are no provincial controls on native hunting.*

- What is the planning process for the annual operating plan?

  *Planning is done by the company and checked by the Forest Service. Blocks, roads and other dispositions and uses are checked.*

- In favour of development and I am satisfied with the Forest Service response.
- Is there going to be a forest after Alberta Pacific logs?

  *Yes. The forest will regenerate with or without our assistance. We can change the composition and structure.*

- Do you plant trees?

  *Yes. The company plants their lands under contractual requirement. The Forest Service plants other lands.The Alberta-Pacific project will involve aspen which will naturally regenerate quickly.*

- I appreciate the chance to see what the government is doing?
- Thanks for helping put out the fires that threatened our area last year.
- What are the effects of FMA on fish? Who addresses concerns in FMA?

  *Fish and Wildlife review the plans.*
- Fish and Wildlife is understaffed, particularly biologists - should have more resources to do inventory and enforcement.
- If Alberta Pacific hires a biologist, what will he do?

  *Work with foresters to identify sensitive species and habitat in advance of harvest.*
- The 1979 ECA report recommended public involvement in FMA - when will it happen?
- What is the status of the 10 year modelling of the Athabasca basin?

  *Ongoing by Environment with input from Fish and Wildlife.*
- Should not be the separation of the process between the EIA for the mill and FMA.
- Pinelands Natural Area will be affected by the mill location.

  *A withdrawal from one area of the reserve will be amended in another area.*
- The Crestbrook socio-economic impact document is not acceptable - too general and too one-sided. No one asked me what I thought, so where did the data come from?
- Object to the process for approval of the FMA. Start over with public involvement and hearings (ECA #38) where public has some meaningful say in what goes on.

  *Public will be invited at some stage to review plans, comment and be heard.*
- My quarrel is not with the project but with the process. At what point in the process were preliminary plans made public?
- Looks like development considers timber only!

  *No. Other values were, and are, being considered.*
- Lets get going! No one has used the aspen, now someone wants to, so I'm in support.
- More jobs would be created by other forms of industry if the same financial incentives were given. More jobs without the environmental impact.
- What is the return to the province from the wood (i.e., stumpage)?

  *20 cents /$m^3$ on the timber cut, but the multiplier effect on investment, wages and salaries is very high.*
- See this whole affair as an experiment, not a viable project where the risks are known before the decisions are made.
- Don't accept that forest renewal is operational (i.e., too many unknowns).

  *I don't accept that position because there is time to learn since we are harvesting only 1%/year.*
- Want public participation in process for project approval!
- How do you harvest hardwoods without destroying softwoods?

  *Declare land base either deciduous or coniferous and manage for that. Clearcut in a single pass to avoid re-entry.*

- I know that the natural fish stocks in this area are declining. I want natural fish stocks replenished.

- There are more jobs in tourism for this part of the province than in a pulp industry.

- Want a moratorium on this development (Alberta Pacific) until questions around mill effluent are answered.

- Why isn't the Fisheries Act mentioned in the FMA?

  *Implicit in negotiations - it is in effect.*

- Softwood stumpage is $\$1.32/m^3$ - why is hardwood stumpage only $\$.25/m^3$. It looks like a low return reflecting an old mentality - increase stumpage to reflect the value to the public.

- There is an apparent lack of preparation in the proposal and negotiations for the FMA (i.e., inventories are lacking)

- Have asked you questions, but have not received good answers. Why don't you know - how can you negotiate in good faith!

- The 1979 ECA report is out of date! It doesn't reflect the current need.

- Have observed streambank destruction. What can be done to control and rehabilitate it?

  *Fish and Wildlife does fence streambanks subject to grazing.*

- Want an EIA prepared for the FMA.

- Will herbicides be used by Alberta Pacific?

  *No. Herbicides are not licensed for forestry applications.*

- Will historic resources be preserved?

  *Known areas are removed from FMA.*

- Does anyone on the panel (local) have concerns about this project?

  *Concern for quality of air and water.*

- Don't think there is a correct way (public involvement) to address these projects.

  *Experience before indicated that we scared off potential investors when we (government) went public.*

## *CALLING LAKE Open House and Public Meetings*

**April 26, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- What are the impacts of project on wildlife?

  *Mainly, improved access results in impact. Some impact from habitat changes, but most of these are acceptable. Species like caribou need old growth and this poses a problem.*

- What are the impacts of project on trapping?

  *Loss of habitat and disturbance. No financial compensation given because up to 3 years advance notice is given to trappers.*

- Community (speaking on behalf of elected officials) are in favour of development. We want an opportunity to participate - both natives and non-natives.

- We have concerns about impact on the environment, but we want the project.

- In favour of development, but wonder where the coniferous component to the AAC is going to come from when all

the sawlog is held by quota. Calculations would indicate that 90 million board feet are needed annually. This is more than all quotas together in the northeast.

- Doubt that 25% of wood supply can be produced in the summer because of terrain and access.

  *Possibly. We may have to log in winter only, but haul from all weather access.*

- Can you regenerate to black spruce?

  *We have committed to research if necessary.*

- What land claims exist in the area?

  *The Bigstone Band has a claim in, but it has not been recognized.*

- Acknowledged opportunities to dialogue with government.

- Government agencies are doing the best they can, but they are understaffed.

  *No commitment to more staff. We will have to re-allocate our resources.*

- Can you enforce the ground rules with the staff you have?

  *Yes. We can maintain our schedule of inspections.*

- Do you expect the government to act on these meetings?

  *Yes. The meetings are being monitored and the panel of experts will report to the Minister.*

- Are you going to use balsam poplar?

  *Yes.*

- Isn't the impact of summer logging on the environment greater than winter logging.

  *Yes. The impact to terrain is greater if wet.*

- What kind of harvest will take place? (pattern, block size, clearcut logging, selective logging).

  *Clearcut by one or two passes in blocks defined by species, terrain and access.*

- What is the rotation age?

  *80 years for aspen, older for spruce.*

- Will you create a monoculture?

  *No. Enough diversity in the boreal forest to prevent a monoculture developing.*

- What endangered species are present?

  *We know about animals, some birds and plants, but much is not known.*

- What if regeneration doesn't grow?

  *Replant after inspections. Free to grow will improve survival of spruce. Aspen will naturally regenerate.*

- Will you use herbicides?

  *No. Not licensed to do so - would like to in order to control competition.*

- Do trappers get compensation?

  *No. They get notice of development.*

- What are you cutting (species, age)?

  *Aspen, poplar, spruce starting with the oldest age classes.*

- What are the ground rules for Alberta Pacific?

  *They are being negotiated right now.*

## *WANDERING RIVER*
## *Open House*

**April 27, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- What are the effects on trapping from forestry (logging)?

  *Loss of habitat and disturbance.*

- Concerned about the effects of water pollution (effluent from the pulp mill on fish?).

- Concern about effects of forestry on wildlife from better access.

- Are there opportunities for farm woodlot forestry (private land forestry), including nursery production?

  *Yes, there are opportunities for farm woodlots to supply timber on a continuous basis. Alberta-Pacific will have a woodlot policy. Presently, the government supplies seedlings.*

- Is there security of supply for the small operator?

  *Yes. The existing quota holders will continue to receive timber to their commitment and additional timber will be made available through permits.*

- Concern about increased traffic through rural areas.

- I am in favour of development because we have no job opportunities for our children. They won't stay if they cannot find work.

- The FMA is too large, too much area to one company - threatens the quota holder.

- Have you got sufficient staff to enforce regulations?

  *Yes, with re-allocation of resources.*

## *GLENDON*
## *Open House*

**May 3, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Increased access will lead to wildlife depletion.

- Trapper compensation.

- Operators wanting to get involved in the woodlot program.

## *GRAND CENTRE*
## *Open House*
## *and*
## *Public Meetings*

**May 2, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Spraying and it's effects on rabbits.

- Small operators are being cut out of the action.

- Department of Fish and Wildlife does not have enough input.

- Use of herbicides.

- Dioxins as a mill effluent.

- Foreign ownership.

- Everything has already been decided. We want a true public hearing, and not these open houses and public meetings.

- Is there sufficient nursery capability and capacity?

- Economics of selective cutting. Why not use selective cutting?

- Increased nursery capacity should be in place before projects are started.

- Ontario has 1000 trees per hectare planted on reforested areas, 38% of the seedlings don't grow. Is this being considered?

- Fish and Wildlife figures state that in 1971, 3.7 moose per square mile in 1981, 1.5 moose per square mile (Swan Hills-Roche Lake area). Why is this all happening, there has been considerable logging in the area.

  *A major tick infestation is probably the main cause. These decreases were pretty uniform across the rest of the province.*

- Clear cut logging on the Blue Ridge road that is not coming back. It is eroding. All the best plans on paper don't seem to make it to the field.

- Logging companies go broke and are no longer able to fulfill their reforestation commitments.

- Some of the cutting procedures do not allow for wildlife shelter.

- There are a lot of questions with harvesting hardwoods. We require more data on this prior to an agreement being reached.

- Harvesting will result in bush and not forests.

- Concern about recent drought conditions and the impact on reforestation plans.

- Burning slash will put more dioxins and particulate matter into the atmosphere.

- When will the Regional Economic Development Commission receive answers to their questions, previously submitted?

- Fish and Wildlife input seems to be how we can accommodate a development rather than taking a lead. More input from Fish and Wildlife is required.

- When is something going to be done to stop the decline in wildlife population?

  *Various response by AFS, Alberta Pacific, Fish and Wildlife.*

- Why do big companies have priority over the smaller companies?

- Why are the big companies allowed to go into areas that the small companies are not permitted access to? Why can the Japanese go into areas that we can not?

- Why aren't there some small companies on tonight's panel?

- Concern over lack of answers.

Following points from the presentation of Everett Peterson, R.P.F. on behalf of the Friends of the Athabasca.

- There are still problems with mixed wood harvesting in terms of forest management and regeneration.

- There is a lack of sufficient detail in forest inventories for the hardwood species.

- There will be more required of silviculture than just letting the aspen suckers regenerate.

- The overlapping tenure system. Which tenure has priority? Should only one tenure carry priority?

- How do we ensure that both hardwood and softwood is removed in one operation.

- How long a period can we tolerate between one harvest and the next when the first operator is anxious to start reforestation?

- How do we ensure one operator can sell or trade resource he does not want or can't use.

- What concerns do we need to address to ensure that good forest management is, in fact, good wildlife management.

# ATHABASCA FOREST

## *FORT CHIPEWYAN*
## *Open House*
## *and*
## *Public Meetings*

**February 23, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- Information is required on the cumulative impact of all proposed pulp mills.

- Monitoring of effluents and impacts conducted by the companies is suspect.

- Will public be part of the FMA process?

  *You have elected a government to represent the public interest in the FMA's.*

- How long after clear-cut for aspen to reach merchantable size?

  *60 - 70 years.*

- How much water is used by pulp mills?

- Why is Alberta Environment not here?

- Will EIA address wildlife populations?

  *EIA will address only the mill effects.*

- Will EIA cover forest operations impact on wildlife?

  *No*

- Are limits going to be imposed on trappers in the Fort Chipewyan area who are outside the FMA, but may have quotas reduced due to no wildlife further south in the FMA?

  *Criteria developed for the FMA's will not be extrapolated up to Fort Chipewyan.*

- Is Fish and Wildlife happy with the EIA not dealing with the FMA?

- More studies on air and water pollution are required.

- How many more pulp mills can the Athabasca River stand?

- More monitoring of water is required. We are still suffering from the Suncor spill.

- What buffer zones are going to be around lakes and rivers?

  *The standard as provided in the ground rules.*

- How many Fish and Wildlife officers will monitor Alberta Pacific's operations?

  *Three*

- Is this number of Fish and Wildlife officers going to increase?

  *We will have to change how we operate.*

- Has increase in Fish and Wildlife staff been budgeted?

- What about muskeg and its importance to caribou and moose?

  *Muskeg does not contain merchantable timber and will not be harvested.*

- We require more assurance that operations will have minimal impact.

- Meeting would have been better 4 years ago before FMA negotiated.
- Will there be a second operation after aspen harvest to log the conifers?

  *No*
- Caribou habitat destruction.
- Company employees carrying rifles.
- Native hiring practices.
- Is there enough timber available?
- Is the pulp mill going to smell like Syncrude?
- What jobs are available?

  *376 positions in the mill, 35 administration, a lot more in the woods.*
- Will a settlement be made with the Lubicons before an FMA is signed with Daishowa?

## *FORT SMITH, N.W.T.*
## *Open House*

**February 24, 1989**

### Issues Raised

An information meeting with the Chamber of Commerce, Wood Buffalo National Park, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Environment Canada and the Town of Fort Smith.

- Very concerned about water pollution.

## *ANZAC*
## *Open House*
## *and*
## *Public Meetings*

**April 11, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- AFS and the companies should be talking to the bands and organizations like ANDC, rather than to individuals or the Metis Association.
- Environment is the biggest issue, especially to the people in Fort Chipewyan.
- There is a need for jobs, but not at the expense of the environment.
- Impact on trappers.
- Training programs and viable employment for displaced trappers.
- Received nothing from the promises made by Suncor or Syncrude.
- How do you ensure local employment when contractors are to be used?
- Is grade 12 required for the mill?

  *No not necessarily.*
- Are the principals of sustained yield incorporated into the FMA?

  *Yes, definitely.*
- Are F & W involved in the EIA?

  *Yes. EIA is received by Alberta Environment and F & W is one of the agencies that will review the EIA.*
- Is it F & W experience that fish and wildlife habitat is enhanced by timber harvest?

  *For some species yes, for others no.*

- What kind of public input is there into the Forest Management Agreement itself?

  *The only public input are these information sessions.*

- What is the process that ensures any good items coming up at these sessions get into the FMA?

  *Whether these ideas get into the FMA will not come to light until the FMA is signed. We expect these issues to be brought to the attention of the Minister. If a response is required to the issue then we can request a response from the Minister.*

- Is there going to be ongoing monitoring of the environment, water quality and air quality at all times to see how the environment is changing?

  *Monitoring is one aspect of the EIA. Those meetings will be conducted this summer.*

- Are security bonds posted before the company does each block?

  *Performance bond is posted at the signing of the FMA. It's about $2 million.*

- What happens if the company can't get their growth back. It's going to cost a lot more than $2 million?

- What happens if the company decides to sell their interest with relation to reforestation and the bond?

  *Whoever buys the company or it's interests must uphold the previous owners obligations. Further dissertation described how a company's progress will be measured.*

- What kind of reforestation standards are being applied to these growth patterns?

  *Provincial standards. McMurray region fits very closely to the provincial standards.*

- How about aspen calibration and growth measurement?

  *We don't have a problem with aspen, it grows quite well.*

- If you cut an area of spruce will it be returned to spruce?

  *In general, yes. If we cut spruce it's returned to spruce.*

- There was mention of hiring locals, how local are we going, to Newfoundland?

  *Alberta Pacific would like to hire people that are now living in the communities. Alberta Pacific will be making training available through the colleges for mill skills for instance.*

- Any percentage for local hiring?

  *No. As high as possible.*

- Will there be a grade 12 stipulation for hiring?

  *If grade 12 was required for a forest technical course by NAIT then yes. If it is not required to be a welder, then no.*

- Are you going to be a part of WHMIS?

  *Not aware, but surmise yes.*

- WHMIS stipulates you must have a grade 12.

  *We would hope to have on site safety programs that would overcome that kind of a problem.*

- Names and comments should not be used in the EIA process.

  *That assurance was provided.*

- Question the $2 million bond when the company has received $300 million in incentives and $75 million in infastructures.

- Will the EIA consider the cumulative effect of other users on the Athabasca River?

  *Yes*

- Will the security deposit be made public?

  *Yes, it will be a part of the FMA.*

- Will the performance bond cover all parts of the companies operation, for instance, effluents?

  *No. It only pertains to the FMA Agreement.*

## *FORT MCKAY*
## *Open House*
## *and*
## *Public Meetings*

**April 12, 1989**

### Issues Raised

The following points were presented at the open house and the presentation of Chief Jim Boucher at the public meeting. The paper presented by Chief Boucher is addressed in more detail in Chapter 4 of this report.

- Forestry projects have already been approved.

- Desire to speak to the expert panel directly. Perceive they are being separated from the experts.

- No EIA's for the Forestry Management Agreements.

- No opportunity for participation in the development of the resource once Alberta Pacific is provided with an FMA.

- FMA is blind to Native concerns of wildlife management, fisheries conservation and co-management of the resource.

- Natives have the most to lose, foreign investors the most to gain.

- There will be no coordinated environmental review of inter-jurisdictional concerns over waters affected, or potentially affected.

- No pre-impact data on wildlife populations in the FMA area available.

- No agreements with natives to allow development of management programs or to participate in long-term management programs.

- Not fair to the oil & gas industry that these forestry projects are excluded from the EIA process.

- No Socio-economic Impact Assessment.

- Current process is inadequate to deal with these forestry mega-projects.

- Forestry Agreement will intrude on native traditional rights.

- Not been able to see wildlife conservation plans, or possible effects on fisheries.

Recommendations

1. The EIA/SIA process must be extended to include all the FMA areas under consideration for these projects.

2. There must be equivalency in the environmental assessment processes applied to the oil and gas industry and the forestry industry, with opportunities for public hearings, input on local development.

3. The issue of Indian Lands, Crown jurisdiction and our longstanding access and management of these lands must be settled before approvals are issued.

4. There must be provision for opportunities for joint management of forestry, wildlife, fisheries and associated resources between the Native people and the government and the developers.

5. There must be a meaningful participation of Native interest in the development and issuance of the FMA agreements.

Other Concerns

- What is the time frame for FMA issuance and construction?

  *EIA in progress and currently negotiating FMA, expect the FMA to take some time, the FMA will not be signed until the EIA is approved.*

- Traplines will be devastated by logging and increased access.

- How are you going to monitor the people going into these areas?

- What is the plan for compensation of the trappers?

  *Compensation program does not change. Changing the habitat does not qualify for compensation unless there is a very significant change.*

- How are you going to communicate with the trapper?

  *Take the cutting plans to the trapper and ask him how this is going to affect his trapping. If there is something unavoidable that happens we would compensate a trapper.*

- How many kilometers of road are you going to be building?

  *Don't know the mileage, but I would be pleased to get back to you.*

- Will there be a trapper compensation program in the EIA or the native policy?

  *In the native policy.*

- How long will it take you to harvest that area, assuming that will be the FMA area?

  *Theoretically forever, based on sustained yield.*

- Is there an associated list of economic benefits to people in the community than would be published in a similar fashion to the AOP's? Will Alberta Pacific do that kind of delineation of opportunities over a time period in this area?

- The public should be informed when economic opportunities will flow to the region. The environmental impacts may flow to the region long before the economic benefits.

- Will Alberta Pacific be responsible for the construction of the roads?

  *Yes, Alberta Pacific would be responsible, but we are also using subcontractors to do all the woodlands operations. Our staff will supervise the contractors doing the work.*

- Once you harvest an area what do you plan to do with the road?

  *It will vary. These kinds of things will be laid out in the management plan.*

- Will there be a chance for ANDC to get a copy of all reports that are being prepared regarding these sessions?

  *Assume yes.*

- When can we expect that report?

  *Early June.*

- When can we expect a reply from the Minister on the presentation made tonight?

  *It is the job of the Forest Superintendent to get a reply.*

- Is the pulp mill itself going to do an EIA, and will they come to the communities directly? The Fort McKay band wants the EIA back up here.

## *FORT MCMURRY Open House and Public Meetings*

**April 13, 1989**

### Issues Raised

- EIA process is inactive.
- No requirement for the government to use the information they receive at these meetings.
- Most of the 144 recommendations in the ECA report were agreed to by the government, but have not be implemented.
- ECA report suggested public input into FMA process in 1979, and to date there has been no public input.
- No complete scientific and independent impact assessment of the woodlands operation.
- Foreign ownership. Japanese industry records concerning the environment have not been good.
- Is government or the company prepared to supply funds for a review of the plans i.e., ten year plans?

  *No*

- It should be incumbent upon the government or Alberta Pacific to hire an independent biologist to ask questions that the public do not have the expertise to ask.

  *There has been an independent panel established by the government that will ask a series of questions and safeguard the public interest.*

- Are those findings going to be made available to the public?

  *Yes.*

- Where can the public get all this information?

  *An explanation of how to access information was provided.*

- Why isn't Alberta Environment here?
- Question the integrity of company-hired consultants.
- There is a difficulty in re-establishing a mixed forest.

Athabasca Native Development Corporation Presentation

- There is limited opportunity to express their concerns.
- Negative impact on the environment, native culture, traditional lifestyle, the legal, constitutional and Treaty rights of Indians and Metis in the area.
- Do not consider input through these meetings to be sufficient.
- Open house meetings are being used as a justification for the developments that have already been approved.
- No EIA for the FMA; not adequate.
- Lack of clear opportunities for economic participation and a timeline for those opportunities.

- Lack of input into the proposed native policies.
- Lack of financial resources to participate in the project.

Recommendations:

1. Consultation with the aboriginal community through regional and local institutions.
2. Positive economic participation expected through to a Syncrude-type of agreement.
3. Expand the EIA process to the FMA.
4. Employment participation through agencies like ANDC.
5. Immediate involvement in developing the native affairs policy.
6. Active participation of the government and Alberta Pacific to seek out adequate financial resources to increase the capacity for the ANDC and local natives to participate in the economic development of the region.

Issues raised by other participants:

- How much water is used by the mill?

  *Will get back to you.*

- What are the government and Alberta Pacific doing to ensure that there will be Caribou around in 10 to 20 years?

  *We will have to do some planning and some studies.*

- Will this Caribou issue be dealt with prior to cutting?

  *Yes*

- Is the panel going to submit their report before or after the FMA is signed?
- When does the public get to look at all the information, all aspects of the projects?

  *Public input comes at the forest management plan.*

- We ask Environment questions and don't get any answers.
- How long after cutting will it take for the forest to return to the condition it is now?

  *70 years.*

- Are there going to be increases in the F & W and AFS budgets to allow for manpower to monitor this project in the Athabasca area?

  *No knowledge of budget being increased. For the short-term I do not see a change.*

- There has been no mention by Alberta Pacific to participate in the trapper's compensation fund as it is in effect in the province.

  *First avenue is mitigation. We don't plan to enter into the compensation program at this time.*

- How many miles of road are you going to have. 50% winter and 50% highway?

  *Don't know the breakdown as of yet.*

- Where is the independent panel going to get their information from? Are you going to do you own intensive study?
- When is the panel going to go around and have their information sessions?

  *Unsure whether that is the mandate of the panel.*

- How many square kilometers are you planning to harvest per year?

*About 40 sections per year (100 square kilometers), but one area is not a complete block of 40 sections.*

- Can't understand why Alberta Pacific would commit to construct before you have a forest management plan in place.

- How can you say Caribou is one of your commitments when we don't have enough data?

  *We will have to try and obtain information on Caribou before they get in there and cut.*

- How is access going to be controlled?

# APPENDIX B

## Analysis of comments from the Open House and Public Meetings

## APPENDIX B

ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

PUBLIC MEETING MONITORING PROGRAM

MEETING COMMENTS MATRIX

(No. of times an issue raised)

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SUBJECTS**

| Forest District (Total # of meetings): | Sustained Yield | Reforest-ation | Negotiations for FMA's | FMA Planning Process | Integrated Resource Planning | Disposition of Timber | Harvest Techniques | Enforcement and Regulation | Access and Public Use | EIA's | Staffing Requirements |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Athabasca (5) | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | 3 | 2 |
| Grande Prairie (8) | 2 | 8 | 3 | 6 | - | 4 | 4 | - | 1 | - | 6 |
| Lac La Biche (9) | 3 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 1 | - | 3 | 6 |
| Peace River (7) | 2 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| Slave Lake (10) | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Whitecourt (2) | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total (41) | 11 | 29 | 20 | 28 | 7 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 20 |

## APPENDIX B

ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

PUBLIC MEETING MONITORING PROGRAM

MEETING COMMENTS MATRIX

(No. of times an issue raised)

**FISH AND WILDLIFE SUBJECTS**

| Forest District (Total # of meetings) | General Impacts | Wildlife Impacts | Fisheries Impacts | Rare and Endangered Species | Inventory and Management | Habitat Protection | Unregulated Native Hunting | Improved Access & Overhunting |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Athabasca (5) | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | 2 |
| Grande Prairie (8) | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 8 |
| Lac La Biche (9) | - | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Peace River (7) | - | 2 | - | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| Slave Lake (10) | - | 3 | 1 | - | 1 | 3 | - | 5 |
| Whitecourt (2) | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Total (41) | 4 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 16 | 8 | 26 |

## APPENDIX B

ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

PUBLIC MEETING MONITORING PROGRAM

MEETING COMMENTS MATRIX

(No. of times an issue raised)

**ENVIRONMENTAL SUBJECTS**

| Forest District (Total # of meetings): | General | Pollution (air and water) | Water Quality | Air Quality | Herbicides | Soil Erosion | Protection of Ecosystems | Climate Change | Risk Assess. | Techno-logy Options | Recycling Products | Archaeology/ Historical Sites |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Athabasca (5) | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2 | - | |
| Grande Prairie (8) | 2 | - | 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 2 | 1 | - |
| Lac La Biche (9) | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Peace River (7) | - | 1 | 6 | 2 | - | 3 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | - | - |
| Slave Lake (10) | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Whitecourt (2) | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 2 | - | - |
| Total (41) | 8 | 10 | 20 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1 |

## APPENDIX B

ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

PUBLIC MEETING MONITORING PROGRAM

MEETING COMMENTS MATRIX

(No. of times an issue raised)

**SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SUBJECTS**

| Forest District (Total # of meetings) | Quality of Life | Employ-ment | Out-fitting | Trapping | Tourism | Recreation | Agriculture | Traffic | Aesthetics | Native Land Claims | Foreign Owner-Ship | Markets, Economic Return | Woodlots |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Athabasca (5) | - | 4 | - | 4 | - | - | - | 1 | - | 4 | 2 | - | - |
| Grande Prairie (8) | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 5 | - | - | - | 2 | 5 | - |
| Lac La Biche (9) | - | 4 | - | 5 | 1 | - | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Peace River (7) | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Slave Lake (10) | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 5 | 2 | 4 | - |
| Whitecourt (2) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Total (41) | 6 | 13 | 1 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 4 |

## APPENDIX B

ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

PUBLIC MEETING MONITORING PROGRAM

MEETING COMMENTS MATRIX

(No. of times an issue raised)

**COMMUNICATION AND CONSULTATION SUBJECTS**

| Forest District (Total # of meetings) | Public Participation | Public Hearings on Forest Projects | Perceived Honesty of Gov't/Industry | Positive to Development | Alberta Environment Absence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Athabasca (5) | 4 | 1 | 4 | - | 2 |
| Grande Prairie (8) | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | - |
| Lac La Biche (9) | 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| Peace River (7) | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Slave Lake (10) | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| Whitecourt (2) | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total (41) | 15 | 10 | 17 | 15 | 7 |

# APPENDIX C

## Media Scanning Key Word Matrix

## APPENDIX C

ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

MEDIA SCANNING KEY WORDS MATRIX

(No. clippings in which key words appears)

| FOREST DISTRICTS | KEY WORDS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | PUB | FMA | FOR | PUL | NAT | GOV | FIS | WIL | WAT | AIR | LAN | TEC | EIA | PUU | POL | SAF | BEN |
| Athabasca | 94 | 20 | 11 | 169 | 12 | 35 | 8 | 18 | 45 | 13 | 10 | 14 | 57 | 11 | 30 | 26 | 40 |
| Grande Prairie | 8 | 10 | 2 | 31 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| Lac La Biche | 21 | 2 | 1 | 31 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
| Peace River | 6 | 11 | 9 | 27 | 1 | 15 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| Slave Lake | 14 | 5 | 4 | 37 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 13 |
| Whitecourt | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| Provincial/National | 102 | 24 | 48 | 281 | 20 | 204 | 12 | 14 | 49 | 6 | 7 | 23 | 54 | 8 | 44 | 30 | 55 |
| Unidentified Source | 63 | 13 | 36 | 101 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 23 | 30 | 14 | 5 | 13 | 28 | 13 | 20 | 9 | 12 |
| TOTAL | 308 | 86 | 115 | 693 | 41 | 303 | 41 | 62 | 161 | 39 | 32 | 75 | 170 | 39 | 113 | 76 | 153 |

# APPENDIX D

## Alberta Forestry, Lands and Wildlife

## Questionnaire

## ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

## OPEN HOUSE & INFORMATION EXCHANGE SESSIONS

## FEBRUARY - APRIL 1989

---

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

Name: (first) _____

(last) _____

Address: _____

_____

(postal code) _____

1. What concerns do you have regarding forest resource use in this area?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Did this meeting provide you with the information you were seeking?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, which areas were no addressed fully?
Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Did you find the speakers to be informed and open to your comments?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

---

4. Do you feel the open house session was worthwhile?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Do you feel the information exchange was worthwhile?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Would you like further information sent to you regarding Alberta's forest resource? If you would like a specific publication, please list the title below:

☐ Yes ☐ No

Title(s)

_____

_____

_____

Please deposit the questionnaire in the box provided
or mail within 2 weeks to:

ALBERTA FOREST SERVICE
PROGRAM SUPPORT BRANCH
10TH FLOOR BRAMALEA BUILDING
9920 - 108 STREET
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
T5K 3M4

*(Reprinted from original)*

# APPENDIX E

## Analysis of Questionnaire Responses

## APPENDIX E

ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

PUBLIC MEETING MONITORING PROGRAM

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE MATRIX

(No. of questionnaires in which subject raised)

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SUBJECTS**

| Forest District (# questionnaires): | Sustained Yield & Reforest-ation | FMA Planning | Disposition of Timber | Integrated Resource Planning | Harvest Techniques | Monitoring and Enforcement | Access Control | Need for EIA's |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Athabasca (13) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Grande Prairie (108) | 36 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Lac La Biche (23) | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Peace River (129) | 37 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Slave Lake (72) | 17 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Whitecourt (7) | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Districts (352) | 101 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 22 | 13 | 6 | 1 |

## APPENDIX E

ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

PUBLIC MEETING MONITORING PROGRAM

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE MATRIX

(No. of questionnaires in which subject raised)

**FISH AND WILDLIFE SUBJECTS**

| | General Impacts | Wildlife Impacts | Fisheries Impacts | Rare and Endangered Species | Inventory and Management |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Forest District (# questionnaires): | | | | | |
| Athabasca (13) | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Grande Prairie (108) | 2 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Lac La Biche (23) | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Peace River (129) | 4 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| Slave Lake (72) | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Whitecourt (7) | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Districts (352) | 8 | 52 | 2 | 3 | 12 |

## APPENDIX E

ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

PUBLIC MEETING MONITORING PROGRAM

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE MATRIX

(No. of questionnaires in which subject raised)

**ENVIRONMENTAL SUBJECTS**

| Forest District (# questionnaires): | General | Inter-Jurisdictional | Pollution (air and water) | Water Quality | Air Quality | Herbicides | Soil Erosion | Preservation of Ecosystems | Climate Change | Risk Assess. | Technology Options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Athabasca (13) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Grande Prairie (108) | 6 | 0 | 12 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Lac La Biche (23) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Peace River (129) | 9 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Slave Lake (72) | 7 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Whitecourt (7) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Districts (352) | 22 | 1 | 23 | 33 | 2 | 4 | 15 | 19 | 8 | 1 | 1 |

## APPENDIX E

ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

PUBLIC MEETING MONITORING PROGRAM

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE MATRIX

(No. of questionnaires in which subject raised)

**SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SUBJECTS**

| Forest District (# questionnaires): | Quality of Life | Employment | Out-fitting | Trapping | Tourism | Agriculture | Transport-ation Corridors | Markets, Economic Return |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Athabasca (13) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grande Prairie (108) | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Lac La Biche (23) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peace River (129) | 7 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| Slave Lake (72) | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Whitecourt (7) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| All Districts (352) | 14 | 10 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 10 |

## APPENDIX E

ALBERTA FORESTRY, LANDS AND WILDLIFE

PUBLIC MEETING MONITORING PROGRAM

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE MATRIX

(No. of questionnaires in which subject raised)

**COMMUNICATION AND CONSULTATION SUBJECTS**

| Forest District (# questionnaires): | Public Awareness | Public Partici-pation | Public Hearings on Forest Projects | Perceived Honesty of Gov't Agencies | Positive to Development (No Concerns) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Athabasca (13) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grande Prairie (108) | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| Lac La Biche (23) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Peace River (129) | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Slave Lake (72) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Whitecourt (7) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| All Districts (7) | 5 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 17 |